

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 11, 1965

The answers were disturbing. Five agencies—none of them the Office of Education—distributed nearly one and a quarter-billion dollars for research and development to universities during 1964. Their funds reached into nearly every State in the Union and went to 124 colleges and universities.

And, on closer examination, it became clear that there is a definite pattern to the distribution of funds. Twenty-five universities received amounts greater than \$10 million. Those same 25 universities together received 58 percent of all the funds awarded to all the universities.

Even more disturbing: 16 schools received amounts greater than \$20 million each—and those 16 institutions accounted for more than 40 percent of all the funds awarded.

Statistics in themselves don't tell the whole story. But, interestingly enough, a student told a newspaper reporter recently: "Just having a professor nod at you in the hall is a big deal. You feel like you've really arrived." And that young man was a student at one of the universities receiving the most Federal R. & D. dollars.

And who sits on the advisory panels of the five Federal agencies which distribute these R. & D. funds? I asked this question because an advisory panel is very important. It sits in judgment on research applications submitted to an agency for financial assistance. Advisory panels were invented so that no critic could ever say a government bureaucrat had turned down a worthwhile scientific project. If money is available and a project is turned down, it is usually because the members of the panel believed it would not contribute significantly to knowledge in the research specialty.

Warren Weaver of the New York Times once wryly described a mythical advisory panel—the "Special Committee for X." "These are men," Weaver wrote, "intensely interested in X, often with a lifelong dedication to X, and sometimes with a recognizably fanatic concentration of interest on X. Quite clearly, they are just the authorities to ask if you want to know whether X is a good idea."

Where do these panel members come from? Of the advisory panel memberships of the 5 agencies here involved, 1,622—a majority of the members—come from the academic community. Amazing correlation exists between the amount of Federal funds for research flowing into a university and the number of faculty members serving on the advisory panels which pass on the grants. The higher the number of dollars, the higher the number of panelists. In fact, the same 16 schools that receive 42 percent of the dollars send 810—or exactly one-half—of all the academic members of the advisory panels to Washington.

Clearly, we are caught up in a vicious circle.

Let us take the case of Professor A. He is very learned about X. He gets a grant to do some research on X—and learns even more about X. Soon his school becomes known as the place to go to do research on X and attracts even more experts. So Professor A finds himself on an advisory panel advising on the directions research in X should take—and even more prestige enhances his university department.

If the Government wants to pay for research in X, where else should they go but to professor A's school? There is no conspiracy—no conflict of interest. If the judgment to be rendered on the Government's part is "where do I get the best research value for my dollars?" the Government would be silly to go anywhere but to professor A's university.

Our system of reliance on a small number of large universities for the great bulk of federally aided scientific research may be the best way to get research done—but does it

benefit our schools? More important—does it benefit our students?

We are beginning now to debate the wisdom of this policy. We have seen the symptoms of dissatisfaction grow. We have seen riots on our great campuses, and on small. We have seen students battle to reverse the "publish or perish" trend among our faculties.

We have seen all these things. But the real tragedy does not lie with young grumbings and unrest. The real tragedy lies in the fact that we have come all this way without seriously considering the consequences of our actions. We have continued to build up the dependence of our universities on the Federal Government—on the fictitious premise that we were only buying research results. But what we have really been doing is changing the character and content of our children's education.

We have drifted too long. Federal policy on education must not be based on pure and simple expediency. Federal policy on education must be geared to a massive assault on ignorance and its evils. Only if this policy is wisely formed, and expertly administered, can education achieve its star role in the Great Society.

ACTION IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, U.S. action in the Dominican Republic has been determined and decisive in curbing the threat of further Communist subversion in the Western Hemisphere. President Johnson's wisdom in moving promptly to protect the lives of U.S. citizens has brought high praise from many sources. I firmly believe that the President has been rightly acclaimed as a dedicated and effective defender of freedom in the Americas.

Recent issues of the Washington Evening Star have carried two articles in appraisal of the administration's course in this troubled area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 3, 1965]

REDS TAKE OVER DOMINICAN REVOLT (By Max Freedman)

Early Wednesday afternoon of last week, the U.S. Ambassador in the Dominican Republic reported to Washington that there was no immediate threat to the personal safety of American citizens living in that country.

Exactly 2 hours later Ambassador Bennett, in a second message, reported that the situation had deteriorated with tragic speed.

The military and police forces supporting the Dominican Government were no longer able to control the situation. In some places there had been an utter collapse of military efficiency. Officers wept openly at the news of spreading unrest and at reports of growing defections.

The Dominican authorities could give no assurances that the lives or the property of U.S. citizens would be protected. They were unable to protect the airfield or the railway station or the port from which American citizens could be evacuated.

No longer could they protect the large hotel or other buildings where some of these Americans had gathered for safety. Nor were they able to protect the U.S. Embassy in Santo Domingo from attack.

Faced with these accumulating proofs of a critical situation growing steadily worse, the Dominican officials strongly urged the Embassy to advise Washington to send enough force without delay to protect and evacuate the endangered American citizens.

The members of the U.S. Embassy, confronted with this new evidence and listening to this urgent plea for American troops to prevent outrages and the tragic loss of life, unanimously agreed that the time had come for direct American assistance. Ambassador Bennett conveyed this unanimous recommendation to Washington and the marines were soon on their way to the Dominican Republic.

It seems clear that some military officers are supporting the revolt and are defying the cease-fire not because they really believe in the rebel cause but because they feel they have no alternative, having once broken their military oath and taken up arms against the Government.

Equally clear to Washington is the danger that the original revolt, started to restore former President Juan D. Bosch to power, is being supplanted by highly trained Communist agents who are seeking to gain control of a revolutionary situation by an almost classic application of Communist tactics.

There are three Communist parties in the Dominican Republic. The first is the Dominican Popular Socialist Party, an orthodox Communist party looking to Moscow for guidance.

The second is the Dominican Popular Movement, a small aggressive party with leanings to China. The third is the 14 July Movement, not completely Communist in character but with a strong Castro influence.

These three groups have not yet formed a united front. That may come later. They are still fighting for the leadership of the revolt. But they are exploiting every weakness, every breakdown in authority, to spread the influence of Communist power.

Their success can be measured by one stark and tragic fact. Many of Bosch's original supporters have left the revolt and have gone into hiding.

Officials in Washington have a list of names of the 58 most important Communist leaders who have seized key strategic positions in the revolt and are twisting it into a Communist pattern. This list contains the names of these Communists and their military and technical training as agents of revolutionary upheaval.

Some of them were trained in Russia, others in China, still others in Cuba. All of them have been identified as active and sinister figures in the present stage of the revolt.

No signs exist as yet of any significant movement of Communist agents from Cuba to the Dominican Republic. It is the judgment of Washington officials that Cuba was taken by surprise by the success which marked the uprising and the weaknesses thus revealed in the crumbling fabric of governmental power.

The local Communist agents, expertly trained and strategically placed, moved in quickly to exploit the situation for Communist purposes. Cuba's future role has to be watched carefully.

Bosch's supporters made a serious mistake. They gave some seized weapons and ammunition to people more eager to loot and plunder for private gain than to fight for the proclaimed cause of the uprising.

Thus, the revolt lost popular favor and became a weapon of anarchy instead of a movement to restore Bosch as the last constitutionally elected President. These excesses drove many moderates into silence or retreat and again gave added strength to the Communist minority.

Even at this critical hour the situation might have been restored if Bosch, by a greater display of personal daring, had left

May 11, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9783

exists. Second, it recognizes that every school child in America, regardless of the type of school that he attends, is entitled to the best education attainable.

This \$1.3 billion law channels funds to help the children of the poor; but in so doing, all American children benefit. It also provides funds to buy textbooks and expand school libraries—including the purchase of books and periodicals. It aims to raise educational services to all students in our communities, in any way local school districts see fit. Bookmobiles, portable science laboratories, special classes, special projects in music or the arts or with museums—only the imagination of our communities themselves will set the limit.

This new great law also provides for funds for basic research to find new techniques and new teaching concepts. And it strives to strengthen State departments of education.

Like the elementary and secondary law, the intent of the higher education bill now before Congress is to provide educational opportunities for needy students attending any college or university—and to a lesser extent for all students attending so-called "developing institutions."

In all of its titles, the \$250 million bill is a general aid to higher education measure. If this bill becomes law, we could expand and develop continuing education, community extension services and adult education. We could strengthen college and university libraries and train librarians. If this bill becomes law, we would have up to 160,000 scholarships for qualified high school students from low-income families.

So we strengthen our massive national commitments to the cause of education. But we have not yet taken one step I believe is absolutely necessary to complete the commitment.

What is needed desperately in the Federal Government is a focal point for education—a voice at the highest levels of Government—an agency to coordinate the expanding programs of Federal aid. In short, we need a Department of Education.

I proposed such a Department this year in Congress. I proposed the Department of Education because a chorus of voices, each with its own point of view—its own program—its own mission, says it speaks for education today. Nowhere is there a comprehensive policy.

The President has made a valiant attempt to bring order out of chaos. By Executive order he set up an Interagency Committee on Education, chaired by a very able and dedicated man—Francis Keppel, U.S. Commissioner of Education.

But where is Dr. Keppel's office? Buried in the tangled web of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; a Department responsible for running nearly 150 different programs, including aid to education, and with a budget that has soared from under \$2 billion in 1953 to more than \$7 billion in fiscal 1966.

But Dr. Keppel and one Office of Education do not administer most Federal education spending. This year, less than a third of Federal funds for education—or \$1.6 billion—is being channeled through the nominal agency for education, the Office of Education.

Where is education in the Federal Government today? It might be more appropriate to ask where it isn't. From the green lawns of Bethesda's National Institutes of Health to Foggy Bottom—from the space age world of NASA to the complex of Health, Education, and Welfare, 42 separate Federal departments, bureaus and agencies are involved in Federal education programs and spending a total of \$5 billion. And each of them makes educational policy—often indifferent or ignorant of the broad national objectives in

the field of education. Look at some of the agencies spending Federal education dollars:

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare itself spends \$800 million for education. These millions are channeled through the Public Health Service, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration and the Welfare Administration—all separate and equal parts of the Department—all separate from and equal to the Office of Education.

The Department of Agriculture spends half a billion dollars a year on education.

Directly concerned with education, the National Science Foundation will channel \$400 million into our schools and colleges this year.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency spends one-third of a billion dollars for college housing loans, the Labor Department \$362 million, and \$77 million is spent for war orphans and veterans education by the VA.

The Department of Defense, NASA, and the Atomic Energy Commission together contribute another \$443 million to education—for the most part primarily in the area of research and science.

And other agencies have their finger in the education pie: The Department of Interior spends \$123 million; the State Department, \$60 million; the District of Columbia government, \$12.5 million; the Canal Zone, \$12.4 million; the Department of Commerce, \$7 million; the Treasury, \$6.1 million; the Justice Department, \$3 million; and the Job Corps of the equal opportunity program, \$190 million.

Next year most of these figures will be even larger, as we add \$1.3 billion from the recently enacted elementary and secondary school aid legislation and hopefully \$250 million for higher education, to the Federal education budget.

Each of the agencies I have mentioned has its own narrow responsibility; none of them is concerned with the whole problem of education. The sums spent by the agencies in many cases are so large that they can distort the aims of the overall aid to education program. That is the tragedy here.

Every year in Congress, we review and pass upon the President's budget. We review and pass on a massive document, complete to the smallest detail of the salaries of employees and the distribution of funds. But you can look all through that massive compilation of information—and nowhere will you find a summary of all the money to be spent for education. To determine the amounts, you must look through each Department and agency's budget—and even then it would be impossible to discover all the items.

One finds no concise summary. Even more important, one finds no one place in the Congress where the impact of the budget on education in America is debated or considered. A Department of Education would change that. A department could give us a central source of information and a central point of responsibility for collecting the necessary data, assessing its relevance, and recommending a policy. Then Congress could really do its job of considering various proposals in the light of their total effect on education in America.

For example, a large slice of the money spent by the Federal Government in educational institutions comes from agencies like the Atomic Energy Commission or the Department of Defense. It is money purely for R. & D.—research and development. Yet it has an enormous effect on our universities, across the board, and this effect raises some serious questions.

Where have our professors been disappearing lately? Perhaps into the laboratories with a few select graduate students. Perhaps into the depths of the Government as consultant. Perhaps to Washington to get themselves grant or research contract renewals.

And where has this left the student? In

many cases, the student is left in the middle of hundreds of his fellows listening to an aloof figure on the lecture platform—distinguished for his works, but unknown to his students. The student is left to discuss the course material with a graduate student in a section meeting. So the student of today has become more and more anonymous—a seat in a lecture hall, a number on a card in the administration office, a statistic in the university records.

There is a popular song around these days all about ticky-tacky. I'm sure you've heard it. I won't presume to sing it for you, but it does repeat a common theme: It sings of boxes—little boxes—and they're all made out of ticky-tacky and they all look just the same. And it goes on about the people in the houses, and how they drink their martinis dry, and how they all look just the same. And the people send their children to the university—and they come out looking just the same.

The song is a bestseller; like most best-sellers it says something that means something to you and me. We are—especially the young among us—greatly concerned with a loss of individuality. The revolt on the campus makes big bold headlines. A growing group of American undergraduates are rebels against their college administrations.

There are probably many reasons for this movement. But this much is clear—the undergraduate wants to feel he belongs to the university, he wants to feel he is more than a number, he wants to feel he is important to the schools. As J. Glenn Gray, chairman of the philosophy department at Colorado College put it in the current *Harpers*:

"There has hardly been a time, in my experience, when students needed more attention and patient listening to by experienced professors than today. The pity is that so many of us retreat into research, Government contracts, and sabbatical travel, leaving counsel and instruction to junior colleagues and graduate assistants. In so doing we deepen the rift between the generations and at the same time increase the sense of impersonality, discontinuity, and absence of community that makes college life less satisfactory in this decade than it used to be. What is needed are fewer books and articles by college professors and more cooperative search by teacher and taught for an authority upon which to base freedom and individuality."

If anyone has lured the teacher from the classroom, it is Uncle Sam.

The Federal Government has helped bring about a fundamental change in higher education in this country—an increasing emphasis on research—a decline in the prestige of the teacher—a growing tendency to involve the academician in the world of government and the world of business. This change has come—not by design—not through regular aid-to-education funds but rather through the back door of research and development dollars spent in our schools.

Who gets the Federal dollar? What kind of schools receive this Federal aid to education? For Federal aid to education it is, despite the protestations of the mission-oriented Government agencies—NASA and the rest—who administer R. & D. funds.

A few months ago, I asked the heads of several departments and agencies in Washington to answer these questions. I asked the Department of Defense, the Space Agency, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Science Foundation to list all the colleges and universities that had received their R. & D. funds in 1964. I asked them to list the moneys the recipient university received. And I asked them to tell me how many members of faculties served on their advisory panels, advising them on the wisdom of their grants.

It is exhilarating. It is, in the words of the President:

"The excitement of becoming, always becoming, trying, probing, failing, resting, and trying again—but always trying and always gaining."

United we stand. And united we gain.

We must gain. Our needs are multiplying. In 5 years, 211 million people will live in our country—half of them under the age of 25.

In 10 years, we will need—each year—over 2 million new homes. We will need schools for 10 million additional children. . . . welfare and health facilities for 8 million more people over the age of 60.

We have no time to lose. We must challenge the tasks at hand.

We must make our cities more livable—places where children can play and men and women can work, in safety and health.

We must preserve our natural heritage before it is lost . . . we must preserve our landscape and our forests. We must preserve clean air and water.

We must find ways to help our rural citizens adjust to technological revolution and social change.

We must solve the problem of mass transit. The commuters present in this room know what I'm talking about.

We have no little dreams. We make no little plans.

President Johnson has proposed—and your Congress is passing—legislation which will help create the freedom and security we seek.

Programs to provide adequate medical care, to better educate our children, to eradicate poverty, to give each man and woman in this country truly equal opportunity.

These investments carry a price tag.

But the cost per thousand or per man or per million of national problems like illiteracy, school dropouts, poverty, delinquency, and, yes, discrimination is far greater than the cost of our efforts to overcome these things.

We spend \$450 a year per child in our public schools. But we spend \$1,800 a year to keep a delinquent in a detention home, \$2,400 a year for a family on relief, and \$3,500 a year for an inmate in State prison.

We must make the investments necessary so that all in our society may be productive. Poor and uneducated people are poor consumers. They are a drain on our economy. They are wasted resources.

But beyond the economic good, there is the morality of our efforts.

We in America have always drawn strength from our belief that democracy can give the greatest reward of all: the opportunity for each man and woman to make something better of himself, in his own way. We believe in the dignity and worth of every man—not just our society as a whole, but each man in it.

That is why we educate a child, or give a hand to those without jobs or hope, or do the things we must do to insure that each American, whatever his color or national origin, shall have his equal chance.

We must do here at home the responsible tasks of freemen if we as Americans are to live up to our beliefs. I ask your support and your work for the programs which will make these things possible.

I also ask your support and work for something else: for the belief that the world need not destroy itself by war, and that we Americans can help others, too, in other places, find a better life.

We hear many voices these days saying that America is overextended in the world . . . that other people's problems needn't be our problems . . . that we ought to close up shop overseas and enjoy our fruits here in the good old U.S.A.

Too easy, my friends. And too dangerous. Who in the world will work for democracy if we do not?

Who in the world can preserve the peace if we do not?

Who in the world can set the example, can offer the needed hand, if we do not?

We live in a time when everything is complex, when there are no more rapid or easy answers. We live in a time when we must exert our patience as never before. Have we the patience, for instance, to continue a disagreeable struggle thousands of miles from home—perhaps for months and years ahead—without any guarantee of final success?

I can tell you that the forces of totalitarianism have that patience.

We must stand abroad as we stand at home: for the pledges made by Americans who came before us. We must love freedom and justice enough to practice it . . . and defend it.

President Johnson has made his commitment to all of us. I join him in that commitment.

THE MESS IN VIETNAM—XIV

Mr. CRUENING. Mr. President, university communities—faculties and student bodies—include a very substantial number of opponents of our southeast Asia policies. They properly reflect Secretary of State Rusk's chiding of the academic world for what he chooses to label its "stubborn disregard of plain facts." A reply from New England university faculty members was published as a three-quarter page advertisement in last Sunday's New York Times. It points out their view that Secretary Rusk and the administration spokesmen are the ones who are guilty of "stubborn disregard of the facts."

The advertisement was signed by over 750 faculty members of 25 New England universities. Harvard leads the list, with 200 signers. Massachusetts Institute of Technology is second, with 137. Brandeis is third, with 89; Yale, fourth, with 62. Boston University has 46; Northeastern University and Tufts University, 43 each. Others are: Andover Newton Theological School, Boston College, Brown University, Clark University, College of the Holy Cross, Dartmouth College, Episcopal Theological School, Goddard College, Simmons College, Smith College, University of Connecticut, University of Vermont, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Cardinal Cushing College, Wellesley, Wheaton, Williams, and Amherst.

The list is an impressive one of outstanding faculty members, but I do not wish to burden the Public Printer by having the list printed in the Record. However, I do ask unanimous consent that the text of the message, entitled "A Reply to Secretary Rusk on Vietnam," be printed at this point in my remarks in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

(From the New York Times, May 9, 1965)

A REPLY TO SECRETARY RUSK ON VIETNAM

In his address on April 23 before the American Society of International Law, Secretary of State Dean Rusk attacked academic critics of the administration for talking "nonsense about the nature of the struggle" in Vietnam. He continued: "I sometimes wonder at the gullibility of educated men and the stubborn disregard of plain facts by men who are supposed to be helping our young to

learn—especially to learn how to think." This abusive language suggests that the administration wants to silence its critics.

This suggestion is confirmed by insinuations from other administration spokesmen about the loyalty of such critics. Precisely in this time of crisis, however, the academic community has both a right and an obligation to point out hazards and inconsistencies in our military and diplomatic policy.

It is easy to see why the Secretary of State is angry. The reasons have nothing to do with "gullibility" in the academic community. He is angry because the facts and wider considerations brought up by these critics have contradicted so many official pronouncements. It is not the scholars but the leaders of the administration who have shown a "stubborn disregard of plain facts."

PLAIN FACTS?

For example, on March 28, 1965, President Johnson said, "We seek no more than a return to the essentials of the agreements of 1954—a reliable agreement to guarantee the independence and security of all in southeast Asia." But the "plain fact" is that the Geneva agreement did not provide for a division of Vietnam into two nations. On the contrary, the agreement spoke of the two parts of Vietnam as "regrouping zones" and said that "the military demarcation line is provisional and should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary." It provided that " . . . general elections shall be held in July, 1966, under the supervision of an international commission" No such unifying elections have been held. The Saigon regime, with United States approval, refused. Ever since, the United States has insisted that Vietnam remain divided.

On April 7, 1965, the President gave another description of the administration's goals. He said, "Tonight Americans and Asians are dying for a world where each people may choose its own path to change," and further on: "Our objective is the independence of South Vietnam, and its freedom from attack. We want nothing for ourselves—only that the people of South Vietnam be allowed to guide their own country in their own way." The plain fact is that the scale of American intervention is incompatible with the goal of self-determination. North Vietnam has, to be sure, intervened by helping the Vietcong. But at every stage of the war the scale of American intervention has been far greater. The manner of combat shows that we have saturated South Vietnam with every kind of military equipment the terrain allows. We airdrop troops and supplies continually. We drop napalm on civilian populations intermingled with guerrillas. We burn and defoliate crops and forests. We have resorted to incapacitating gas. An intervention as massive as this does not furnish a choice to the people. It deprives them of one.

STUBBORN DISREGARD OF PLAIN FACTS

If American actions in Vietnam are defensible, administration attempts to defend them should square with the plain facts. Self-deception about American intervention can be a greater peril than discriminating protest. Only by recognizing the ambiguities of the situation can we reach accord with the deepest levels of the American conscience and with the common conscience of mankind. The administration may have contrived the discreet silence or the grudging lipservice of some foreign governments and of some U.S. Senators, but the hazards and inconsistencies of the present policy are widely recognized both at home and abroad.

The situation in Vietnam raises serious moral questions, not merely diplomatic and tactical ones. As a nation we hold immense power. To permit it to be used in reckless and barbarous ways is to imperil the entire basis of American leadership.

May 11, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9791

my office received a letter from Nathan H. Cohen, president of Monarch Construction Corp., developers of the American Towne House. At that time, suggestions and comments on Monarch's program were requested. Knowing very little about Mr. Cohen's enterprise, I merely replied, in a routine fashion, that I strongly favored middle-income housing projects, and that his programs seemed designed to produce such projects.

Shortly after that, there was published a full-page advertisement which contained both my letter and letters from many other Senators and from Members of the House of Representatives. The impression created by the advertisement was that all those whose letters appeared there were endorsing and praising the Monarch Construction Corp. An endorsement was not my intention; and I strongly condemn the careless use of my name in a commercial advertisement of this type.

What has particularly distressed me is that I have recently received information that Mr. Cohen, the Monarch Construction Corp., and the American Towne House program have been charged with numerous instances of fraud and deceit, and are now under intensive investigation by the office of the U.S. Attorney.

Therefore, I wish to reiterate and to make crystal clear, for the purposes of anyone interested in these enterprises, that I have never given any commercial endorsement to this concern, and that Mr. Cohen has been instructed to cease all use of my name in his advertisements. It is my sincere hope that no unsuspecting buyer has been led astray by the appearance of these misleading newspaper advertisements.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S ACTION IN REGARD TO THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, once again all Americans have every reason to be proud of the President of the United States for the swift and decisive manner in which he has exercised his position as leader of the free world.

The President's determination to resist communistic aggression, wherever it may exist, and especially in the Western Hemisphere, was never more clear than in his swift action to aid in the perilous situation last week in the Dominican Republic.

While the United States and the President may receive some criticism in the world community, and even within the boundaries of our own Nation, I, for one, want to go on record as affirming my confidence in his action and my pride in his leadership. As President Johnson said time and time again, the United States desires to extend its control over no other nation and no other territory. We merely desire to insure that any country which wishes to do so, may freely choose its own form of government, without outside interference.

Anyone who has doubts about the intentions of the United States need only reflect upon the words of President Johnson in his address to the Nation on

the nature of our commitment in the Dominican Republic:

Our goal in the Dominican Republic is the goal which has been expressed again and again in the treaties and agreements which make up the fabric of the inter-American system. It is that the people of that country must be permitted to freely choose the path of political democracy, social justice and economic progress.

The action of the President can in no way be interpreted as a return to "gunboat diplomacy." The primary reason for sending in marines was to protect American lives when law and order completely broke down in that war-torn country, and when officials of the Dominican Republic informed the United States authorities that they could no longer insure the safety of Americans.

The marines were protecting both the lives of Americans and the lives of thousands of citizens of the Dominican Republic and of citizens of European and other Latin American republics, which were made safe because of the action of President Johnson.

Furthermore, all Americans and the citizens of all other countries should be reassured that the United States is not interfering in foreign internal politics or taking sides with any of the factions in the Dominican Republic uprising. Our sole purpose is to protect human lives and to insure that the cancer of communism does not gain another foothold in our own backyard.

The United States has announced and demonstrated its good intentions in the Dominican Republic by providing food for the hungry and medical supplies and treatment for the sick and the wounded in that troubled area.

Surely, for these reasons, all freedom-loving people of Latin America who yearn for the decency and dignity of democracy will join President Johnson in his hope that shooting and bloodshed will cease and that a stable government will be instituted in the Dominican Republic.

It has been a source of pride for me to see the response from the editors of our Nation's newspapers to the President's actions in Latin America. Eugene Patterson, the Atlanta Constitution, and the outstanding editorial department of that newspaper have been in the forefront of informed news analysis. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record three of the informative editorials which have been published in the Atlanta Constitution.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Atlanta Constitution, May 1, 1965]

GIVE UP WHAT IN VIETNAM?

(By Eugene Patterson)

My difference with the quit-in-Vietnam wing of U.S. liberalism is a deep one because I believe they are advocating—without meaning to, which makes it worse—that this Nation quit on liberalism. The sword they demand be surrendered is their own.

In varying degrees of anguish or triumph these good people write to tell me the Vietcong is winning thus far, which is true, that President Johnson ought to negotiate an end to the war, which they do not seem to recognize is the very thing he is trying to do, and that the United States is just plain

wrong in Vietnam, anyway, which is an incredible irony, coming from them.

For it will be peace-seeking idealism, not hotspur jingoism, that will lose if the United States loses in Vietnam.

This country had its taste of the dangers and failures of Dulles-Radford brinkmanship based on a politics of status quo and threats of massive nuclear war. Then liberalism especially was cheered when President Kennedy and President Johnson tried to limit the nuclear danger by developing the option of limited war.

Failure in Vietnam will mean the failure of that option, rekindling all the dangers inherent in a resurgence of the bomb-Moscow mentality.

Civic action, counterinsurgency, grassroots aid, U.S. special forces—these were Mr. Kennedy's bright new hopes for prevailing against communism's small "wars of liberation" on the home ground without having to pulverize Peiping.

The bomber wing at the Pentagon never did much approve. The new tactics were based on helping the people we were to defend; on creating political and economic systems that were to be better for them than any other; on teaching national armies to become the friends and helpers of their own peoples, and not just instruments of authority or tools of feudalism. It was to be an historic experiment, based on the codes of military honor, to humanize the soldiery, to use the plowshare as well as the gun, to repel the guerrilla aggressor by winning the people to something better.

In short, it was to be an experiment in idealism, a search for a positive pro-people program as an alternative to a negative anti-communism frozen in the nuclear syndrome.

Naive, gullible, infantile—all these adjectives have fitted mistakes made during the tryout of this new kind of war in Vietnam. But one would have expected to hear them come from the big-war believers in nuclear force, and not from the wing of political thought that advocates more idealistic social and economic reform and less blind reliance on the bomb.

Yet now that the going has gotten rough, and mistakes have mounted, and success has not come conveniently within sight—and indeed, may not—the demand that we give up comes first and loudest from the very people who ought to stay longest and fight hardest.

With no illusions at all about the many failures our experiment in idealism has suffered in Vietnam, I'll say, thanks. War is with us. I am proud my country has tried—whether it fails or not, has tried—to learn limited war based on creation of needed reforms, as an alternative to unlimited war based on unfeeling power. Those are, I am afraid, the untidy alternates.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, May 1, 1965]

SWIFT U.S. ACTION IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC WAS NECESSARY; IT'S NOW UP TO OAS

Vietnam is not the only trouble spot for the United States and its long-range goal of world peace. Our awesome power, which has prevented a major conflagration, has not prevented those frustrations of national revolutions, rivalries and clashes between states and the ever-present threat of a major explosion.

We're now involved in the Dominican Republic, the Caribbean island country, which is in the throes of a violent revolution. An undisclosed number of Marines and airborne troops have landed on the island, presumably to protect Americans until such time as they can be evacuated. Estimates of the number of troops already involved range up to 5,000, indicating our ability to move swiftly and perhaps decisively in what obviously has been determined in Washington to be an

attempted repetition of Castro's Communist takeover in Cuba.

Already there are outraged voices from some of the members of the Organization of American States. Memories of the old cry, "the Marines have landed," have aroused lingering suspicions of the giant from the north. Faced with the necessity of a quick decision to protect American nationals, President Johnson had no time to consult OAS members. If at the same time he was following the Kennedy doctrine that this country will not tolerate Communist takeovers of any more Latin republics, he has acted in our own and the hemisphere's interests.

The President disclaims any intent of occupying the Dominican Republic. But the presence of American troops will tend to act as a brake on violence, permitting the OAS to move in as intermediary in the absence of an organized government. If necessary, our presence will prevent a Communist takeover, Castro-style, which no Latin country wants.

The Dominican Republic, after its many years of dictatorial rule by Trujillo, faces a long and tortuous road to democracy. After his years of cruel dictatorship, the door to an even more cruel dictatorship of the left has been left open. That is the vacuum into which the United States has been forced to move and the OAS should lend its support. The main concern now is to establish a reasonable government so that the marines can leave.

[From the Atlanta Constitution, Apr. 30, 1965]

THE JOHNSON BRAND
(By Eugene Patterson)

WASHINGTON.—Disparaged often as a merely political animal, President Johnson likes to point earnestly and a little sensitively to the character of his appointees.

The Johnson cadre now taking full form can hardly be called partisan, he points out. He adds that he simply sent for the best men, that none among them asked him for the job they got.

This President has, in truth, gone about staffing the Government in unique ways. For his principal talent scout he did not choose a political adviser but a civil service professional, John Macy. Macy does operate loosely through the politically knowledgeable White House staff, but they report back to him and he recommends to the President. Their telephone inquiries cover the country and final selections are made from long lists of carefully weighed possibilities.

The faces fit no set forms. Nicholas Katzenbach, an abrupt and intense intellectual, and John Doar, a ruggedly reticent John Wayne type, were considered Kennedy men (even though Doar joined the Justice Department under Ike). But Mr. Johnson chose them for his own, on merit, as Attorney General and chief of Justice's civil rights division respectively.

Secretary of the Treasury Henry Fowler is small and silver haired, soft spoken and pleasant—a southerner. ("You fellows have a dynamic base down there in Atlanta," he says.) But the steel shows in his eyes, his mind is quick and his word is firm. He may work some quiet surprises.

Secretary of Commerce Conner is a strong man in a post that has not always been strongly filled. He has differed in the past and still does with some L.B.J. policies. A maverick and a man of action, he has about him a tough vitality that you sense in the top businessmen. He stopped for lunch in Atlanta a couple of years ago, when he was head of the Merck pharmaceutical empire and I remember him then expressing some reservations about Medicare. But not blinks. He felt industrial retirement plans had created the inadequacy of medical care

for the elderly masses, and he was searching his mind for some positive way whereby private employers might fill the gap before Government did.

Of the new Johnson crop, one of the most impressive is Adm. W. F. (Red) Raborn, Jr., who was sworn in Wednesday as chief of the CIA. Sandy haired and weatherbeaten, Raborn is a hardfisted administrator who demands the impossible. In developing the Polaris submarine missile years ahead of schedule, he got it. But he laughs off compliments about that. "I know what they mean when they call me the father of Polaris," he smiles. "They know how little the father has to do with the baby—and they know it's somebody else who really has to get the job done."

Raborn recalls with pleasure, incidentally, a recent trip to Callaway Gardens in Georgia. He says he has been a great admirer of Georgia Representative HOWARD (BO) CALLAWAY since the Congressman let him fish his well-stocked bass pond.

ARMENIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY,
1965

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, today we live in an era when the future of many groups of peoples around the world hangs in the balance. The world is unsettled and no one can now say how the pieces will fall back together. Uncertainty and instability are the rule in many areas of every major continent. The nature and rate of economic and political progress will unfortunately not be determined solely by the people themselves, but instead by the larger struggle known as the cold war.

Self-determination of peoples remains, a noble ideal which we shall never abandon no matter how difficult it is to achieve in practice, and in spite of the apparent permanence and stability of oppression from without. The 47th anniversary of the Armenian peoples' declaration of independence on May 10, was a reminder that the situation of minorities and nations today is nothing new to history. We learned a bitter lesson from the events that followed the achievement of independence of the Armenian people and many others in 1918. We learned that minority nationalities cannot maintain their own independence unaided in the face of more powerful neighbors.

Today it is our policy to try to forestall this all-too-familiar pattern. We finally have come to the realization that a passive role, and the attempt to be a sideline umpire play into the hands of the aggressive power seekers and ideologists at loose in the world.

The Armenian Republic was not only a victim of her oppressors, but a victim also of apathy and inaction on the part of those who could have helped her before it was too late. The historic homeland of the Armenian people was attacked and divided in 1920 by the ancient enemies, Russia and Turkey, taking advantage of the general state of postwar chaos and exhaustion to dominate others and extend their borders.

There is not a single barbarity known to man that the Armenian peoples have not suffered. For many people in the Western World their first realization of genocide was that of the Nazis in World War II. But in 1915, while the great

powers were locked in the First World War, Turkey took the opportunity to massacre and deport nearly 2 million Armenians within the crumbling sphere of Turkish power.

It is a tribute to the vitality and resourcefulness of the Armenian people that they were able to establish themselves as an independent republic only 3 years later when the opportunity came. We salute the Armenian people and pray that their unquenchable spirit of freedom will once again find expression in the world's political structure.

MISSOURI RIVER RESOLUTIONS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD 10 resolutions adopted by the Missouri River States Committee, and forwarded to me by Gov. Nils Boe, of South Dakota. The resolutions deal with resources matters before the Congress, and will consequently be of wide interest.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 1—WATER POLLUTION RESEARCH
LABORATORY

Resolution of Missouri River States Committee, Omaha, Nebr., April 15, 1965

Whereas the Missouri River is the longest river in the United States; and

Whereas this river serves some 529,000 square miles of land important to the welfare of both Canada and the United States; and

Whereas water is the lifeblood of this area serving human, natural habitat, agricultural and industrial needs; and

Whereas the quality of this water must be maintained at a level to serve intended uses; and

Whereas the development of this area tends to degrade this water quality to a level unfit for intended use; and

Whereas the degradation of this water is peculiar to this area, demanding special restorative measures and practices; and

Whereas the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, under Public Law 89-88, approved July 20, 1961, shall establish, equip, and maintain field laboratory and research facilities in various sections of the country to prevent and control water pollution; and

Whereas laboratory sites have already been selected for several regions outside the boundaries of the Missouri River Basin, making service to this basin impractical, if not impossible; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Missouri River States Committee on this 15th day of April 1965, requests the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to locate a regional water pollution research laboratory in the Missouri River Basin at a site selected on the basis of the criteria set forth in the Gross committee report, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1962.

RESOLUTION 2—SOIL CONSERVATION AND ACP
FUNDS

Resolution of Missouri River States Committee, Omaha, Nebr., April 15, 1965

Whereas the work of millions of years in soil formation can be completely destroyed in a century, a generation, or overnight. Therefore, soil conservation is the most important of all resource conservation programs, for it is from this resource that the food and fiber for this generation and all future generations must come.

Whereas preventable erosion of topsoil through lack of adequate soil conservation contributes to the floods so damaging to both rural and urban areas. Uncontrolled

May 11, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9859

The fact is, however that in the Dominican Republic the emergency was believed to be so acute that there was no time for a thorough inquiry before acting, and that neither the Charter of the OAS nor the existing setup of the OAS provided the machinery for dealing with the emergency. It can be said, as President Bosch is saying, that his supporters were on the verge of winning when President Johnson stepped in. But it appeared to President Johnson that Communists trained by Castro were very near to seizing control of the Bosch rebellion. If they had done so, the situation in the Dominican Republic might well have been irreversible. There would then have been no more constitutional elections. The U.S. intervention, though it was unilateral and in violation of Article 15, has to be justified on the ground that it prevented an irreversible situation, whereas now the way is still open for a democratically elected government.

If the United States is to come out of the affair with clean hands, it must persuade its neighbors in this hemisphere that the charter, which was adopted in 1948, must be supplemented and developed in order to meet the conditions which were not known or realized 17 years ago in 1948. The charter was based on the proposition that, with the defeat of Hitler in 1945, there was no further external threat to the peace of the hemisphere, and that the problem was how to end forever the U.S. interventions in Latin American affairs which had been going on for something like a hundred years. Article 15 is directed to this.

The United States agreed to the doctrine of the charter, being itself convinced that the hemisphere had nothing further to fear from Europe, and that the U.S. interventions in order to protect American interests were out of date. But what neither the Latin American governments nor the United States realized in 1948 was that an American Republic, Cuba, was to undergo a revolution that might make it, as happened in 1962, a military outpost of a foreign power.

For this contingency the OAS was not prepared, and public opinion in the American Republics was not prepared. Even before the Cuba missiles crisis of October 1962, as a matter of fact, as early as the autumn of 1961, the American Republics have been talking about the problem. The Conference at Punta del Este, Uruguay, was convoked in December 1961 in order to discuss the problem of "the intervention of extracontinental powers directed toward breaking American solidarity." (From the resolution of the Council of the OAS on December 4, 1961.)

The fact of the matter is that the OAS had not carried that discussion to a point where the organization was ready to deal with the emergency which broke out last week. It is this deficiency which needs to be repaired, and only when it is repaired will our unilateralism in the emergency be overcome and our violation of the letter of an inadequate treaty be purged.

It is, I believe, upon such a foundation of candor and humility that we can bring about the solidarity of the hemisphere. On our part, candor and humility compel us to admit that we acted outside the law because we deemed it obsolete for the emergency. On the part of our neighbors, candor and humility call for a recognition that the OAS is an underdeveloped institution for realizing the ideals which it proclaims.

EVANS AND NOVAK BIAS IS SHOWING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to again call attention to the recurring effort of many news commentators and writers to treat the left and right in American political thinking in a different and, I feel, unfair manner. I have pointed out several occasions where the New York Times referred to "far right" or "rightwingers" while at the same time calling their counterpart "liberals" with no adjective.

In the Washington Post column of Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, which was carried on Sunday, May 9, 1965, we once again see this device. I point this out with particular interest because it has long been the stock and trade of Marquis Childs, Walter Lippmann and other writers of the left but not Evans and Novak. They have usually been fairer. Referring to the seven Democrats who voted against the \$700 million additional authorization for Vietnam and the Dominican Republic military ventures, Evans and Novak charitably referred to them as super liberals.

Now there is a real label—super liberals. In the same article they refer to a "group of rightwing Republicans who financed Ronald Reagan's speeches." Now, tell me Rowland and Bob why is it "far right" or "rightwing" when it comes to conservatives and Republicans but it is only "liberals," or in this case "super liberals" when it comes to the other side of the political spectrum?

This is not to take anything away from the small group of Congressmen which opposed the President's request. They are very ardent in their views but by any honest political termination they would be as far left as the right-wing backers of the Ronald Reagan speeches of last fall. Why is it that most writers continue to use this unfair terminology in labeling the various shades of American political thought?

The conservatives never seem to get a fair break. Is this deliberate? You can read the New York Times for weeks and rarely see "left wing," "far left" or "leftist" but they label most conservatives by the "far-right," "right-winger" label.

The entire article is included at this point in the RECORD:

L.B.J. FEELS ON GOP: PRESIDENT QUICK TO SNATCH UP FORD'S IDEA OF VIET FUND AS VEHICLE FOR SUPPORT

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

All Washington has been ooh-ing and ah-ing about President Johnson's political mastery in getting a congressional vote of confidence for his foreign policy without realizing that the idea really came from a Republican: House Minority Leader GERALD FORD, of Michigan.

The Ford assist came last Sunday night during a bipartisan emergency session of congressional leaders called at the White House by Mr. Johnson because of the Dominican crisis.

With congressional leaders from both parties seated around the Cabinet table, the President made it clear he was upset about the Capitol Hill sniping—Democratic sniping—against the U.S. hard line in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. Through much of this monolog, Mr. Johnson was glaring at Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, his old friend who has called for a pause in the bombing of North Vietnam.

Mr. Johnson implied that Congress ought to show the world it really backs up his policies. Moreover, he went on, if his critics in Congress desired, they could amend the resolution of August 1964, giving him a blank check in Vietnam.

It was at this point that FORD got his inspiration. Congressional resolutions are old hat, he said. Besides, that blank check authorization on Vietnam was passed by Congress only last August. Asked FORD: Wouldn't it be more effective for Congress to give the President a vote of confidence by passing a special appropriation for Vietnam?

Mr. Johnson snatched FORD's fast ball and ran with it. He sent the \$700 million request to Congress 2 days later (after first taking it up privately with White House aids).

Although the money isn't really needed, the appropriation was widely billed as a display of confidence. Moreover, there were fewer defecting Democrats (only seven superliberals in the House) than would have been the case with a policy resolution.

A footnote: Although the appropriation was a Republican idea, House Republican leaders had to work hard to get a unanimous Republican vote. One conservative southern Republican was ready to vote "no"—not because he opposes a hard foreign policy but because he opposes unnecessary appropriations.

An offer by the California group of rightwing Republicans who financed Ronald Reagan's speeches on television last fall has been rejected by House Republican leaders. The offer: To promote a regular series of money-raising political shows over nationwide TV.

This group is the old TV-for-Goldwater-Miller Committee headed by James Kilroy, a militantly conservative Los Angeles realtor. The Kilroy committee has sent public relations man, Robert Ralsbeck, to Washington on several visits the past few months.

Ralsbeck's mission was to get permission from the House Republican campaign committee, headed by Representative BOB WILSON, of California, to start a regular series of money-raising political shows (to get contributions from viewers). Initially financed by the Kilroy committee, the shows' proceeds would go to House candidates in 1966.

Most important, the programs would have been produced under the overall direction of Ralsbeck's firm, P.R. Counsellors, Ltd. (which produced the Reagan shows for the Kilroy committee).

Wilson, House Republican leader GERALD FORD and National Party Chairman Ray BLISS were understandably suspicious.

What worried them was that in the hands of militant conservatives like Kilroy (who still controls an estimated \$160,000 left from the Goldwater-Miller campaign), the films might embarrass the Republican Party.

To guard against the possibility, Ralsbeck and two members of the Kilroy committee on their last visit here guaranteed not to interfere with the political "line" of the TV series.

But WILSON and FORD remained skeptical. More significantly, so did BLISS. Again they said "no." Kilroy will have to look elsewhere to spend his money.

Alaska's Democratic Senator, ERNEST GRUENING, is hurting badly back home because of his passionate opposition to President Johnson's no-retreat policy in Vietnam.

What is damaging the 78-year-old Senator is not so much his stand on southeast Asia but the fact that his violent disagreement with the President has undercut his prestige in the White House.

More than any other State, Alaska depends on the good will of the Federal Government. It lives on Federal benefits. There are deep fears that these benefits might be affected as a result of the Gruening-Johnson split.

Despite this, GRUENING voted against the President's request for \$700 million for the war effort in Vietnam but (attempting to temper the effect of that vote) came out strongly in favor of Mr. Johnson's intervention in the Dominican Republic.

NEED FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Mr. OTTINGER (at the request of Mr. KREBS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on January 13 of this year we were privileged to receive a message from the President on a matter vital not only to our country but to our friends and neighbors overseas as well. On the same day, my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. CELLER] introduced a bill to effect the President's proposals—H.R. 2580.

Because this legislation is of such great significance, I should like to take this opportunity to present the statement I sent to Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary for insertion into the hearings on H.R. 2580:

STATEMENT OF HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER, OF NEW YORK, TO SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1 OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, CONCERNING H.R. 2580, A BILL TO AMEND THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. Chairman, I thank you and the members of the committee for allowing me to submit a written statement into the hearings on H.R. 2580—a measure of great importance and one on which action is long overdue.

I feel there are few areas in our law which more urgently demand reform than our present unfair system of choosing the immigrants we will allow to enter the United States, particularly under the archaic and inequitable national origins quota system. This system embarrasses us in the eyes of other nations, it creates cruel and unnecessary hardship for many of our own citizens with relatives abroad, and it is a source of loss to the economic and creative strength of our country.

While I believe that our immigration laws must first serve the best interests of our Nation and must contain a clearly defined system of selective controls, I feel that the provisions contained in H.R. 2580 are far better than the national origins quota system, which makes no attempt at all to distinguish which immigrants will best serve the interests of our Nation. As President Kennedy so aptly noted in his book "A Nation of Immigrants": "The use of a national origins system is without basis in either logic or reason. It neither satisfies a national need nor accomplishes an international purpose. In an age of interdependence among nations such a system is an anachronism, for it discriminates among applicants for admission into the United States on the basis of accident of birth."

It is my belief that the bill under discussion would make it easier to bring to the United States persons with special skills and attainments that we need and want; it would reunite thousands of our citizens with members of their families from whom they are now needlessly separated; it would remove from our law a discriminatory system of selecting immigrants that is a standing affront to millions of our citizens and our friends overseas; and, it would provide for the needs of refugees and serve our traditional policy of aiding those made homeless

by catastrophe or oppression. In essence, this measure would accomplish all these necessary goals without damaging the interests of any person or group, either here or overseas.

It is obvious that if a change were not necessary in our immigration laws, four Presidents would never have called attention to this serious flaw in our legislation.

Some sections of our immigration laws are particularly unjust, such as that which involves the Asia-Pacific Triangle where the quotas are not on the basis of one's place of birth but rather on their racial ancestry. As our distinguished Secretary of State noted: "It represents an overt statutory discrimination against more than one-half of the world's population."

Of almost equal inequity is the fact that much of the total quota goes unused each year. Thus, while England and Ireland are assigned 83,000 persons a year, or about one-half the total for all nations, and use only about 32,000 persons annually, most of the other countries of the world must suffer under small quotas which are, in the greater majority of cases, heavily oversubscribed.

Our great Nation was built by immigrants of courage and ability who came from many lands. We have benefited from the genius of men who came to our country, often seeking religious, political or intellectual freedom—men such as Albert Einstein, Neils Bohr, Enrico Fermi and thousands of others. Our country has prospered not only economically from the contributions of these people, but also socially and culturally.

Under the protections provided in this bill, I am convinced that the proposed law constitutes no threat to our labor force. Governmental studies show that the present quality of immigration results in the creation of more jobs than the immigrants themselves take and, in many cases, the immigrants are highly skilled and can make major contributions to our science and industry. This bill emphasizes needed skills whereas existing legislation virtually ignores them.

I would submit as a further safeguard, however, that while preferences should be provided to meet particular labor shortages, I do feel that this preference must be precisely defined and properly administered. Furthermore, I feel a definite distinction needs to be made between those jobs which are permanent and those of purely a seasonal or temporary nature.

Another provision which is salutary is the establishment of an Immigration Advisory Board. I feel this Board would be most useful in providing in-depth evaluation of the operation of the new law. Also, this Board would serve to help remove some of the injustices in the present system by administering the pool of unused quotas during the yearly reduction of these quotas. However, on decisions pertaining to the existence of labor shortages in particular fields, I feel the Secretary of Labor should be given a more active and clearly defined role than is apparently envisaged. The Secretary of Labor possesses the necessary information on which to base sound judgments in this area of concern.

In essence, then, it is my belief that H.R. 2580 will clarify our policy and bring it closer to the desires of the American people. It will demonstrate to the world our dedication to equal and just treatment of immigrants. I take this opportunity to urge this committee to issue a favorable report on this bill. I join with the President in urging my distinguished colleagues "to return the United States to an immigration policy which both serves the national interest and continues our traditional ideals."

Again, Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank you and the members of the committee for allowing me to present written testimony on this subject.

DR. FREDERICK ALBERT COOK

(Mr. McCARTHY (at the request of Mr. KREBS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, last March I noted that this was the centennial year of the birth of one of the greatest of American polar explorers, Dr. Frederick Albert Cook. At that time I inserted in the RECORD an article in the highly reputable Journal of the Arctic Institute of North America, which called for a reopening of a scientific study of the North Polar expedition of Dr. Cook.

The case for Dr. Cook is strong and should be reviewed by fair minded men—

The article declared. Accordingly, as the 100th anniversary celebration approaches, I am gratified to know that the New York State Legislature has seen fit to memorialize this outstanding yet largely unrecognized son of the Empire State, whose remains lie in Forest Lawn in Erie County.

The legislature has memorialized the Governor to proclaim Thursday, June 10, as Dr. Frederick A. Cook Centennial Day in New York State, urging appropriate ceremonies. The people of Delaware Township in Sullivan County have organized a centennial committee, and the town has authorized a historic marker which will be erected at Dr. Cook's birthplace. A civic celebration will be held June 13.

I join with my fellow citizens in honoring the memory of this great explorer, who gave two decades of his life to further our knowledge of the uttermost ends of the earth in both the North and South Polar regions. If there is no objection, I would like to insert the following resolution of the New York Legislature sponsored by my good friend and able colleague, Mrs. Dorothy A. Rose:

RESOLUTION 185

Concurrent resolution of the senate and assembly memorializing His Excellency, Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, to proclaim Thursday, June 10, 1965, as Dr. Frederick A. Cook Centennial Day in New York State

(By Mrs. Dorothy A. Rose)

Whereas Dr. Frederick Albert Cook was born 100 years ago this June 10 in the hamlet of Hortonville, Sullivan County, in the State of New York; and

Whereas Dr. Cook is acknowledged as being a pioneer American polar explorer, a physician and scientist who participated in the early expeditions in both the Arctic and Antarctic, a writer, author of several books, lecturer and traveler; and

Whereas Dr. Cook's accomplishments have been acknowledged by various scientific and geographic societies, including knighthood by Leopold, King of the Belgians, and a gold medal presented by the King of Denmark; and

Whereas Dr. Cook was given honor by the giants of polar exploration of his day, including the discoverer of the South Pole, Roald Amundsen, and his two decades of service toward the expansion of geography and science in both polar regions have earned him an important place in polar history; and

Whereas the fruits of his 20 years in the farthest reaches of the earth resulted in his reaching, on April 21, 1908, the geographical North Pole, and the subsequent recognition of this feat by the Royal Danish

May 11, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9861

Geographical Society and the University of Copenhagen, whose honors remain in force; and

Whereas such authoritative sources as Steller's Atlas and the Italian Military Polar Institute have joined with many polar historians, explorers, and scientists in recognizing Dr. Cook as the discoverer of the North Pole; and

Whereas recent studies and explorations of the polar ice cap tend to corroborate the original observations made by Dr. Cook 56 years ago, and recognized proceedings such as the journal of the Italian Geographical Society and the journal of the Arctic Institute of North America have called for a serious study of his polar expedition; and

Whereas a group of explorers, educators, oceanographers, and students of polar exploration have joined to form the Dr. Frederick Albert Cook Society, nonprofit educational organization seeking to gain official recognition for the scientific and geographic accomplishments of Dr. Cook; and

Whereas on June 10 next in the community of Callicoon, county of Delaware, Sullivan County, the society will be joined by the officials of the township and the Sullivan County Historical Society in celebrating the centennial of Dr. Cook's birth; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of New York also seeks to honor the accomplishments of this native son who passed to his reward in his 75th year on August 5, 1940 and who is now buried in Forest Lawn Cemetery, Buffalo, Erie County: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the senate concur), That Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller be and is hereby respectfully memorialized to issue a proclamation designating Thursday, June 10, 1965, as Dr. Frederick A. Cook Centennial Day in New York State and calling upon the people of the State to mark and observe that day with appropriate ceremonies and exercises; and be it further

Resolved (if the senate concur), That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to His Excellency, Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller.

By order of the assembly.

JOHN T. McKENNAN,
Clerk.

SALUTING THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION ON ITS 30TH BIRTHDAY

(Mr. JONES of Alabama (at the request of Mr. KREBS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues in saluting the Rural Electrification Administration on its 30th birthday.

REA to me has always been one of the most rewarding Federal agencies ever created—a wonderful example of good purpose and great deeds.

REA has been an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture for the last 26 years, and I would be remiss today if in my salute to REA I did not include Orville L. Freeman, the Secretary of Agriculture, and Norman M. Clapp, the REA Administrator.

REA is once again a vital and driving force in rural America, with a deep sense of purpose. Secretary Freeman and Administrator Clapp believe that the way to economy in this great program is through strengthening the rural systems by permitting them to develop to their

full potential and thus become less dependent on Federal financing.

They also believe that the real objective of Congress when it wrote the Rural Electrification Act was to make electricity available to people in the country on a parity with the rates and services enjoyed by people in the cities. I agree with them support them in this endeavor.

There is a gap between the price of electricity in the country and the price in the cities and towns. This gap should not be permitted to exist and something is being done about it. Let us look at the record.

In my home State of Alabama, the REA-financed distribution systems were able to make only four rate reductions in fiscal years 1961 through 1964, but so far in the first 10 months of this year, six already have made reductions for a total savings of \$223,500 to consumers.

Alabama has 27 REA electric borrowers, including 24 cooperatives. They serve approximately 224,000 consumers over more than 40,000 miles of line. And like rural people everywhere, these consumers are using more and more power. In 1953, the monthly consumption per consumer on REA-financed lines in Alabama was 221 kilowatt-hours; 10 years later, in 1963, it had climbed to 540 kilowatt-hours—more than double.

The rural people of Alabama are proud of their electric systems. They are locally owned and they represent private enterprise at its very best.

It was President Johnson, who as a Member of this House in 1948, said:

If ever there was an enterprise wholly American in concept and character, it is the program of extending the blessings of electricity to all people who live in the rural areas of our land.

In the 30 years of the federally sponsored rural electrification program we have seen rural America move into its rightful place as an important segment of our society; we have seen the people of rural America come alive, to enjoy many of the privileges and pleasures that had hitherto been only the privileges and pleasures of city people. And why? Because the marvel of electricity moved in over the lines of the REA systems.

In Alabama, I watched the REA loan programs, both electric and telephone, play a major part in the preservation and improvement of the family farm. The availability of electric power and telecommunications has enabled the family farmer to become more productive by helping him to make more efficient use of his family's time, his capital, and his resources.

Electricity, which has many important applications in the mechanization of such farm enterprises as dairying, poultry and egg production, and hog and cattle feeding, has enabled the family farm unit to increase production without the employment of additional human labor. Electricity—working for pennies a day—has proved an efficient and tireless “hired hand” which can help overcome rising costs and marketing problems.

Electricity also has made life on the farm more attractive to young people and has helped discourage migration to urban areas. Today the farm family can enjoy the same standard of living, including electric kitchen appliances and equipment, laundromats and dryers, air conditioning, television and radio, and electric heating, which is available to the people residing in the towns and cities. I know firsthand of a number of young people in Alabama who have built their homes on their families' farms, and remain in the country to carry on operations that their parents might be forced to abandon when they become too old to work.

The availability of electricity also has been essential in creating new nonfarm enterprises in the rural areas. The new jobs created by these commercial firms represent important supplementary income to many members of farm families and are enabling them to weather the current cost-price squeeze and to continue to maintain their homes in rural areas.

But despite the great inroads rural electrification has made in making rural America a better place in which to live, half the poverty of our country is concentrated among 30 percent of the American people who reside in rural America.

President Johnson, Secretary Freeman, and Administrator Clapp have called upon the rural electric and telephone systems to assume a leadership in the war on poverty and to help in bringing about the Great Society. The systems were asked to help because our country's leaders are aware that the people who pioneered rural electrification possess the initiative and the know-how to tackle difficult jobs and get results.

Under the rural areas development program of the Department of Agriculture, and through REA's own RAD staff, REA electric and telephone borrowers from July 1961 to the end of 1963 helped to launch over 900 industrial and business enterprises in rural areas. These projects created more than 60,000 direct jobs and over 40,000 indirect jobs in supply, service, and other related industries.

A total of \$750 million was invested in these enterprises, of which more than 90 percent came from State and local sources, including private capital and commercial lending institutions. About \$43 million was provided in Federal funds, including loans from the Area Redevelopment Administration and Small Business Administration. Less than \$2 million came from financing through loans to cooperative systems under section 5 of the Rural Electrification Act.

The assistance given by the REA borrowers to these enterprises has generally involved technical aid in developing sound projects and locating financing, rather than participation in the financing. Availability of electric and telephone service from the REA borrowers has often been an important factor in the location of these new enterprises.

REA borrowers in my State and elsewhere in the Nation have responded

magnificently to this call to rid our countryside of poverty.

The REA-financed rural electric systems also have the great task of meeting the demands for more power in an expanding rural America. Not long ago, President Johnson said that "in the next 25 years, the rural electric cooperatives of the United States will be lighting the lamp of our Nation's progress." The REA borrowers are on the way to making this prediction come true. And while they are doing it, we must never forget that these rural electric systems are a permanent segment of our society and of the electric industry. They have earned the right to be treated as such. We wish them many happy tomorrows.

A BILL TO STRENGTHEN PRESENT FEDERAL DISASTER RELIEF PROGRAMS

(Mr. BRADEMAS (at the request of Mr. KREBS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on Palm Sunday, in Indiana and again last week in Minnesota, a devastating series of tornadoes ripped through the Midwest. One of the hardest hit areas was my own congressional district in Indiana which, according to the Red Cross, suffered 54 dead, 242 injured, and millions of dollars in property damage. The response of the local, State, and Federal governments and many private organizations and citizens to the emergency needs of the stricken areas and communities came quickly and effectively—first aid, food, and temporary shelter were provided.

We are very grateful to those public officials and private citizens who gave so unselfishly of their time and energy in the hours and days immediately following the disaster.

On April 14, 3 days after the tornadoes struck Indiana, President Johnson, my colleagues, Senators VANCE HARTKE and BIRCH BAYH, Buford Ellington, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, Gov. Roger Branigin of Indiana and I toured part of the stricken area of my district, particularly the little community of Dunlap, near Elkhart. The extensive damage, total in some places, and the personal suffering and tragedy stunned and moved us all.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, at this point I insert in the RECORD an article from the April 14, 1965, South Bend Tribune describing President Johnson's visit to Dunlap:

L.B.J. VIEWS DUNLAP RUINS, PROMISES FEDERAL AID FOR STORM VICTIMS—PRESIDENT CALLS SCENE HORRIBLE

(By Jack Colwell)

President Johnson today walked through rubble south of Elkhart which once was a subdivision and then he promised Federal assistance for the survivors of the tornado which leveled the area.

Again and again the President shook his head in disbelief as he viewed the wreckage left by the Palm Sunday tornadoes which killed at least 54 persons in Elkhart County and at least 86 throughout northern Indiana.

As the President stepped aboard his plane at 11:08 a.m. at the St. Joseph County Airport to fly to other tornado and flood disaster areas in the midwest, he was asked if Federal aid could be expected for the devastated area he had just seen.

"Yes," said the President.

Johnson arrived in South Bend for his whirlwind tour at 8:40 a.m. A crowd of about 2,000 greeted him at the airport.

TEN THOUSAND IN ELKHART WELCOME

Scattered spectators were along his motorcade route through South Bend to the northern Indiana toll road.

As he drove through downtown Elkhart, enroute to the nearby Dunlap disaster area, Johnson was greeted by 10,000 spectators.

"Horrible, just horrible," Johnson said as he viewed and walked through the wreckage of the Sunnyside subdivision at Dunlap. He talked with some of the tornado victims who had lost their homes.

"I'm sorry," he told them.

Several times Johnson was asked if he had ever seen such devastation. He shook his head "no."

There was a grim expression on Johnson's face throughout most of the hike through broken boards, shattered glass, and scattered household furnishings.

VIEWS RUBBLE IN SILENCE

Much of the time he just stood amid the rubble, saying not a word.

He climbed onto what was left of a porch of a damaged house to see what was left inside.

For a while he stood atop a pile of debris near where someone had affixed a tattered American flag.

After his first stop, to see a crushed house trailer, the President and accompanying officials, including U.S. Senators BIRCH E. BAYH and R. VANCE HARTKE and U.S. Representative JOHN BRADEMAS, moved to the heart of the destruction in the Sunnyside area.

Then they visited disaster headquarters at the nearby Concord Township fire department, where Johnson had a cup of coffee and a sweet roll.

"I sure thank you," the President told the woman who served the coffee.

TALKS WITH YOUNGSTER

"Thank you for what you're doing for these people," he told her.

The coffee counter was set up in the station by members of the fire department auxiliary to help disaster victims who still were probing the acres of wreckage in search of personal belongings.

Although the Johnson of today was far different from the talkative, hand-shaking, exuberant Johnson of campaign days, he took time out to talk to a little boy and ask "Are you my friend?" The little boy said "Yes."

Johnson signed an autograph with a sprawled "L.B.J."

And he had an "L.B.J." pin for another youngster.

For a moment he stopped to talk to Mr. and Mrs. Carl Sharkey, residents of the leveled Kingston Heights subdivision adjacent to Sunnyside.

COUPLE DESCRIBES ESCAPE

They told the President how they had escaped serious injury by finding shelter in the basement as the tornado struck.

"I'm thankful we got out of it, even if it did take our home," Sharkey told Johnson.

Sharkey assured the President that Mrs. Sharkey's black eye was the result of the storm and not action on his part. The President and spectators, many of them homeless victims of the tornado, chuckled.

"Good luck to you. My thoughts are with you," Johnson told the Sharkeys as he left.

Johnson spent about a half-hour in the subdivision destruction area. He spent about 10 minutes at the fire station.

He stopped the motorcade only once during its path through the downtown and residential sections of South Bend and Elkhart. That was to shake hands with some schoolchildren gathered along Lincoln Way West not far from the airport.

NATION "STUNNED, SHOCKED"

In a short speech at the airport immediately after his arrival, the President said all the Nation was "stunned and shocked over the weekend by the tragedies which struck so many families and communities in so many of our States."

He noted that he was making the tour of disaster areas with Buford Ellington, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, in order to find out what the Federal Government could do to help.

"We pray that our technology and science will some day enable us to exercise greater measure of control and prevention" over natural disasters, Johnson said.

"Until that day comes, I know it is the will of the American people that whenever their neighbors or friends in any community, in any State, suffer such losses at the hands of nature, the Government of this good and generous people should be ready and prepared to assist in every useful way," he said.

"This is the reason we are here."

He said the Federal Government at such times "must not be something cold and far away" but instead be a "warm neighbor."

The President said he hoped his visit and the visit of the other officials would "enable our Federal assistance to the States and communities to serve more effectively, more promptly and more efficiently in the tasks of reconstruction and rebuilding that face the citizens of this area."

When Johnson left here, he headed by plane for Minnesota, where he was to view flood damage along the Mississippi River.

He planned to fly over and view tornado damage in Illinois and Iowa while en route.

After leaving Minnesota, the President was to fly to Toledo, Ohio, to inspect tornado disaster sites. He was to fly over and view tornado damage in Michigan on the way.

Mr. Speaker, what had been suburban homes in neat little subdivisions at Dunlap had been replaced by dirt-covered and broken boards, shattered pieces of glass, and scattered debris which had once been furniture. Neat rows of mobile homes were replaced by a field of useless rubble.

Entire families were killed; others lost sons or daughters or wives or husbands. The human loss was the worst of any natural disaster in our history.

We saw and heard all this and more. My district deeply appreciated the time President Johnson had taken to pay a personal visit. His visit also emphasized to the people of my district, and I am sure of all the districts he visited, that the entire Nation shared in their suffering and stood ready to assist them.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I enter in the RECORD at this point, three editorials written about the President's visit to my district:

[From the Goshen (Ind.) News, Apr. 15, 1965]

HERE AND GONE

The President of the United States has come and gone. It didn't take him long.

His visit to Elkhart County on an inspection tour of disaster areas in six Midwestern States was brief but timely. It came at a time when a lift in spirits was welcome.

Hundreds of people who voted for him and scores upon scores who didn't turned out to greet him on a motorcade swing through Dunlap, the hardest hit area in Indiana.

May 11, 1965

60 speeches a day. Quite often when someone was listening. Then suddenly, at the peak of his career, he vanished.

Oh, how it will bring tears of joy to the eyes of his millions of oldtime fans to learn that he lives. Yes, today the once-famous Hubert Horatio Whatshisname lives quietly in the humble obscurity of the Vice Presidency.

And while we must respect his wish for privacy, we oldtime fans cannot help but envision how happy he must be humbly putting about his humble new duties in his humble new role.

Scene: The breakfast nook of a humble cottage at the end of a one-way lane in the backwash district of Washington. It is dawn. Hubert bounces energetically up and down in his seat as his wife prepares his morning meal.

Mrs. H: "Now that you've retired from active life, dear, must we still rise so early? Look, the sun is just coming up."

Mr. H (solemnly): "Yes, precisely as our great President, Lyndon B. Johnson, pledged that it would."

Mrs. H (sighing): "I wish you wouldn't start working on your job before breakfast. Will you have some eggs?"

Mr. H: "Yes, please. I would dearly love two clear examples of the wise planning inherent in our great President's forthright program to increase the productivity of our fine American chicken ranchers. Scrambled."

Mrs. H: "Really, dear, while I love the simple anonymity of your new job, you must miss expressing your opinions."

Mr. H: "Nonsense. As our great President said to me, 'Hubert, there's room for a wide range of opinions in my administration. As long as they don't conflict with mine. And you don't get your name in the papers.'"

Mrs. H: "That's nice, dear. Do you like your eggs?"

Mr. H (annoyed): "You know I can't call him up at this hour to ask a silly question like that. Hand me the paper."

Mrs. H (blanching): "Oh, dear, you promised not to read the papers any more. You know what it does to you."

Mr. H (stanchly): "I know, but if I wish to be a success in my new job, I must calmly overcome this foolish reaction. Here you take the Great Society section, while I coolly read the headlines, which say, 'President Sends More Troops to Vietn * * *'

Agggghh. Ooogghh. Quick, open the door of the broom closet. I feel an attack coming on. (As he dashes into the broom closet.) Fellow Liberals, our outrageous policy in Vietn—"

Mrs. H (slamming the door behind him and locking it): "Phew. That was close. It sounds like a long one. I'll set the timer for 2 hours and then peek to see if he's done."

Teenagers Carry Fight to the Rivers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEC G. OLSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, we frequently hear criticism of our teenagers. Newspaper articles reporting misdeeds of a small portion of our young people do much to create a bad image for all. Because teenagers seldom have an opportunity to rate headlines for their good deeds, I was pleased to see the article in the April 23 Washington Post by Alfred D. Stedman

citing the generous efforts of Minnesota teenagers who assisted in controlling the recent flood. Mr. Speaker, I request this article be reprinted in the RECORD. I also request that a recent report from the Minnesota State civil defense office be reprinted:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 23, 1965]

A TARNISHED IMAGE IS WASHED AWAY BY FLOOD

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

ST. PAUL, MINN.—Came the Mississippi's worst floods in history, and up from the schools and colleges and universities sprang a student army to save the day.

Their generation had been headlined as "lost" and "troubled" and "wayward" and "fickle." But on the banks of the raging Mississippi and its rampant tributaries, they pitched in with the margin of nerve and muscle that did the job.

In fact, the performance of students whose antics have worried parents and puzzled professors from Yale to Berkeley may turn out to be the biggest bright spot in the whole murky story of the floods.

FLOCKED TO FLOOD SCENE

Adults managed and directed and did their share of sandbagging and diking. But it was the grit and energies of thousands of boys and girls from campuses and classrooms that, at the crisis, tipped the balance against the floods.

Some hailed the youthful feat as a transformation for the better from weird student doings and attitudes. Some guessed that perhaps education may be cultivating youthful values and capacities that aren't always visible. Others asserted the student generation has been all right all along, being merely exposed by a small minority to public misunderstanding and a bad press.

But as to the facts, there's complete unanimity. It was no bunch of hopeless beatniks or social rebels who flocked to the flood scene from nearby high schools and by busloads and carloads from fraternities and sororities and college dorms. It was instead an able-bodied volunteer force of determined young people, in quick grasp of the emergency and ready to take orders for action to meet it.

Up and down the Mississippi and its feeder rivers, the story was clear and undisputed. At Mankato, the teenagers fought the floods around the clock on both banks of the Minnesota River. "They were magnificent," said Mayor Rex Hill. "The stamina of the girls was especially amazing."

At Stillwater, they teamed with adults, including 50 State prison convicts, in erecting what was christened the "condike" to contain the St. Croix River overflow and save the city. Generally in the Upper Mississippi Valley, the role of the student flood fighters in reducing or averting destruction was judged "highly significant" by Col. Leslie P. Harding, U.S. Army District Engineer at St. Paul.

Sitdowns? Sex? Unwillingness to take orders? Vandallism? Disrespect of authority? Not a sign of any of such objects of complaints about campus conduct was observed day or night by Colonel Harding, his assistants or others in charge of flood work. Nothing of the kind, reported the Washington County sheriff, Reuben F. Granquist of Stillwater.

CONTRAST STUDIED

The contrast with the image of a rebellious student generation is not at all surprising once the basic motivations of students in the contrasting roles are understood, commented several who work closely with them.

"They want to be useful," said School Superintendent Thomas D. Campbell of Stillwater. "When they see an outlet for service, they leap for it."

Agreeing completely, the University of

Minnesota's director of student activities, Donald R. Zander, expressed confidence that, in the same kind of emergency the student response would have been just as heartening on other campuses, including Berkeley. In a swiftly changing world, the students are insistent on freedom to explore ideas, but that motive, said Dr. Zander, is wholly consistent with their urge for useful service.

At least, in the light of the flood story, a fresh look at the character of the student generation can make worried parents feel much better than they did.

[From the Office of the Minnesota State Civil Defense]

Of the 6,000 unpaid, unsung volunteers that slogged in the mud at the dikes in Mankato, literally thousands had not yet seen their 20th birthdays; many not their 15th.

Those young people worked to the point of exhaustion in the muck and rain; catching a few hours sleep only to join the battle with renewed vigor that only comes with youth.

While the younger ones filled the sandbags with blistering hands, the older or more sturdy types struggled with the weight of them to the top of the dike—girls as well as boys.

This was not going on only in Mankato. A coastguardsman was quoted as saying that if it wasn't for the kids in Minnesota, there wouldn't have been a volunteer dike raised in the State. The teenagers in every affected city and town carried the fight to the rivers. It was seen in Rockford, in Henderson, in Wabasha, and East Grand Forks.

Our kids filled the breach left open by the lack of adequate control measures.

Dominican Responsibility Should Be Taken by OAS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our distinguished colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the Sacramento Bee, on May 4, 1965, regarding the U.S. involvement in the Dominican Republic and the OAS.

The text of the editorial follows:

DOMINICAN RESPONSIBILITY SHOULD BE TAKEN BY OAS

President Lyndon B. Johnson acted swiftly and decisively to meet the threat of a possible Communist seizure of the long-troubled Dominican Republic.

The sending of American troops into that country has ended any immediate threat another Castro-type regime will be established in the hemisphere. But large-scale intervention also has imposed on the United States a great responsibility.

The government which eventually will take over power must be one representing the will of the people of the Dominican Republic and meeting the approval of the Organization of American States.

The President has enunciated a firm American policy to prevent the establishment of another Cuban-type regime in Latin America. It also should be American policy to prevent the return of an oppressive, reactionary regime such as existed under Generalissimo Rafael L. Trujillo, under the guise of anticommunism.

You have the liberalized depreciation guidelines on new equipment.

You have the 7 percent investment credit.

You have the overall income tax reduction—ranging to 27 percent for small corporations.

You get a double dividend there. You get the immediate dividend from immediate reductions in your taxes and comparable increase in earnings. And you get the feedback from a strong rate of economic growth. And you are getting that now.

The Department of Commerce predicts that capital expenditures will rise this year to a new peak of \$50.2 billion—an increase of 12 percent over last year's record of \$44 billion.

New domestic orders for cutting tools totaled more than \$78 million in February which was 29 percent more than the total for February of last year.

And so the policies of the President and the Congress have strengthened the small business sector across the board.

President Johnson has taken a personal interest in small business programs.

He personally inaugurated a small loan program in 1964 that brought a quick response from smaller businessmen. The SBA under the direction of its very able Administrator, Gene Foley, set new records in loans made last year and will set new records this year.

Our current economic expansion has broken all peacetime records.

We are now in the 50th month of healthy and sustained growth.

And economists who a few months ago were predicting a slackening in 1965 are now predicting that this rate of growth will continue throughout this year.

President Johnson and the Congress are determined that this growth rate will be sustained and are prepared to introduce added stimulus when it is needed.

We know that your industry has done a tremendous job in tooling up the Nation—without which our country would not be great. We know you are dedicated energetic businessmen.

But we know you have some problems which are often beyond your control.

We know that many of you feel that equitable financing for new machinery is not available to you.

We know that many of you feel that the rates charged by some elements of the private sector are too high.

We know that some of you are utilizing Small Business Administration programs but that many of you hope for a specialized SBA program tailored to your industry.

I know that you are disappointed that an element of the private sector declined to go along with one carefully prepared proposal.

Some of you have found the answer in existing SBA programs. I wonder if all of you understand the opportunities and the details of these programs. I understand, however, that a small business forum to be conducted by SBA is on your agenda for tomorrow and I am sure you will receive a thorough and complete briefing on that agency's programs.

Certainly there are many instances wherein members of your industry have prospered and progressed with the assistance of the SBA.

Certainly there is presently Government assistance for your industry.

But it is still felt that a complete program is lacking.

Chairman EVINS and the committee think we need to determine what your industry needs and then find some way to fulfill those needs.

And so for that reason, Chairman EVINS is announcing today, and has authorized me to announce it first to you here now, that the House Small Business Committee is going to hold hearings on your problems during the 89th Congress and is going to come up with recommendations for their solution.

Chairman EVINS and the committee are concerned.

They are concerned when they hear that our exports of machine tools have declined steadily since 1957 with the exception of two categories—metalworking and power generating.

They are concerned when they hear that with two minor exceptions our share of the imports of machine tools has dropped in all regional world markets.

They are concerned when they hear that our share of the world production of machine tools has dropped from more than 24 percent to less than 20 percent.

They are concerned when they hear that our machine tools generally are older than those of some other nations.

They are concerned that machine tool and die manufacturers in other nations can undersell our industry by 30 percent.

They are concerned that we seem to be lagging in research and development of information in the machine tool and die industry.

We have got to get this modernization underway—and underway on a massive scale.

Chairman EVINS in his speech prepared for delivery here stated—and I quote—"The tool and die industry is the heartbeat of our free enterprise system.

"It must move ahead with the times.

"We cannot fiddle while the competition from foreign toolmakers burns hotter and hotter."

And so the House Small Business Committee will conduct fact-finding studies to help you find the best possible course for modernization.

The committee will study all alternatives of financing.

It will document the need for modernization.

It will pinpoint problems and recommend steps to counter them.

Chairman EVINS and the committee are sympathetic to you and your problems.

The committee exists to serve small business.

It exists to explore the problems of small business and to help it down the paths to solutions.

That is what we intend to do in your case.

Thank you for allowing me to appear before you today. We shall look forward to seeing some of you at the hearings during this term of Congress.

Thank you.

Hoppe's Columns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Arthur Hoppe, the columnist from San Francisco, has prepared two very good and amusing columns on affairs in Washington, the first one published on the 26th of April in the San Francisco Chronicle and the second one on the 29th.

I am sure that many of the readers of the Record will enjoy these two articles, which follow:

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Apr. 26, 1965]

Mr. JOAD GOES TO WASHINGTON

(By Arthur Hoppe)

"How'd it go, Jud?" Mrs. Jud Joad asked anxiously as her husband sank down on the bench in the little park across from Poverty

Corps headquarters. "Was they glad to see you?"

"To tell the truth, Maude," said Mr. Joad, "I don't rightly know whether it was worth the long trek up here from Appalachia Corners. Oh, they was mighty glad to see me, I walks right in and tells this pert young lady who I am and what I want."

"I seen by the papers," I says, "that you are recruiting poverty fighters for the war on poverty," I says. "At \$20,000 a year on up. I am an old man," I says, "but I am not too old to fight."

"Oh Jud, that took grit," said Mrs. Joad, squeezing his arm. "Well," said Mr. Joad, "pretty soon this smart-looking young fellow in shirtsleeves comes out. He looks at me and says, 'My Gawd.' Then pretty soon there's a whole passel of these young fellows standing around, staring. 'It's a genuine victim,' says one, kinda awed like. You could tell they never seen the likes before. I was mighty proud."

"Let's take him in to see Sarge," says one. "It might be worth a couple of columns in the dailies." So's they take me in to see their sergeant, who's right nice. "What can I do for you?" he says.

"Well, I tells him all about my fighting poverty from the Texas dust bowl to the piney woods of Georgia, man and boy for nigh on 70 years. 'So,' I says, 'figuring my country needed my vast experience, I come to fight for you. And I'll settle for half pay.'"

"You are a patriotic American," says he. "But we got 12 different programs going at the moment. Now, drawing on your vast experience, which would you say was the best way to fight poverty?" I give this a couple seconds' thought and then I tell him. "With money," I says.

"By Gawd, says he, 'you and I think alike. That's just what I been telling them up on Capitol Hill. You got the right outlook to be a member of our team.'"

"I ain't much at sports," says I. "No," he says, "I mean fighting poverty. Just you look over this here list of jobs and see which one suits you best." So's I do, but none make much sense. Like "community services planner" and "public relations coordinator." But finally I seen one: "pilot program director—\$22,500." "That one," says I. "Never been up in no aeroplane, but I ain't too old to learn."

"Well," says he, "we'll give you the usual tests and interviews and see how you do." So's they give me all these tests and * * *

"Jud," said Mrs. Joad impatiently, "stop frittering and tell me, did you get the job fighting poverty or no?" Mr. Joad shook his head sadly. "Nope," he said. "I ain't qualified."

"Well, don't take it too hard, Jud," said Mrs. Joad, patting his shoulder. "I don't," he said. "The sergeant bucked me up. He says I should go home and fight at the community level. On a volunteer basis. And while he didn't exactly promise, I figure he may land me one of them jobs yet. Soon as I get a little more experience."

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Apr. 29, 1965]

LET'S NOT FORGET THE FORGOTTEN

(By Arthur Hoppe)

It is time for another chapter of "Where Are They Now?"—that nostalgic, heart-tugging series which tells of the unforgettable greats of yesteryear now tragically forgotten by a fickle public.

And who will ever forget the fighting liberal, that crusader for the oppressed, that independent-minded Senator who wore no man's yoke—the unforgettable Hubert Horatio Whatshisname.

Oh, who can help but feel a warm inner glow on remembering this human dynamo in his heyday—battling the militarists and the trusts, standing up for the cause he believed in without fear or favor, making 50 to

It would be tragic, and in the long run, disastrous, if American intervention proved to be the instrument of returning the destiny of the Dominican Republic to the hands of a military oligarchy opposed to social progress and democracy.

Juan Bosch was elected President by an overwhelming majority of the Dominican people in 1962 during the first really free election in the history of the nation. He has called on the rebels fighting for his return to power to lay down their arms and not to fight our soldiers.

This could open the door to a peaceful solution which would serve the interests of the Dominican people and at the same time eliminate the threat of a Communist-dominated government.

As rapidly as possible the United States should turn over to the Organization of American States control of the peacekeeping activities now being carried out by U.S. soldiers.

The OAS also should assume full responsibility for determining the proper, legitimate government of the Dominican Republic. The intervention of America, based on concern for a Communist seizure, must not be the prop to support a reactionary, repressive regime.

However, the intervention will have been in a good cause if U.S. troops assist the OAS in bringing peace and an honest government responsive to the needs of the people.

Excise Tax on Entertainment Equipment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, on February 8, 1965, I introduced H.R. 4471 to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the manufacturers excise tax on entertainment equipment to alleviate the economic burden on consumers.

I believe my colleagues would appreciate being informed of the reasoning for the introduction of this legislation:

TEN REASONS WHY CONGRESS SHOULD REPEAL THE 10-PERCENT FEDERAL EXCISE TAX ON TELEVISION, RADIOS, PHONOGRAPHS

Most excise taxes were levied on the American people by Congress during World War II and the Korean conflict as fundraising measures for the Nation's defense effort. They were described as wartime and temporary taxes.

The following reasons explain why the 10-percent manufacturers excise tax imposed on radios, phonographs, television sets and their components should be repealed to remove the burden imposed on the consumer, encourage the growth of ultra high frequency (UHF) television broadcasting, promote the economic well being of the industry and stimulate the national economy.

1. Tax repeal is the logical second step after the all-channel TV law.

This industry became "double taxed" when Congress passed a law effective May 1, 1964, requiring a separate UHF tuner on all TV sets, raising the price as much as \$30 per receiver even though 80 percent of purchasers cannot now, and many may never use this added equipment. Leaders of Congress and Government agencies concerned have advocated excise tax repeal to offset this added burden on the consumer.

2. Excise tax cuts will be passed along to the consumer.

The reduction in the average price of black-and-white television sets from \$270 in 1950 to \$140 in 1965 demonstrates the intensity of competition and efficiency in this industry.

Compared to the Department of Labor wholesale price index of 100 for the base years 1957-59, the December 1964 wholesale price index was 87.2 on radios, phonographs, and television, whereas all other commodities averaged 100.8. Portable radios, for example, had a price index of 60.1. In fact, radios, phonographs and television had one of the lowest price indexes of all consumer items in the Nation.

The administration, the Congress and the consumer can be assured by this industry's pledge and past performance that the benefits of excise tax repeal will be passed on to the consumer through lower prices, thereby bringing the hoped-for result—a boost in the national economy.

3. Excise taxes on radios, phonographs, and TV fall on those who are least able to pay. The history of tax philosophy has been to alleviate the burden of the taxpayer least able to pay—the family—particularly the lower income family for which these media are often the sole means of entertainment and enlightenment. To these families a radio, phonograph or television purchase represents a much more substantial expenditure than it does for the higher income groups.

4. The householder pays a discriminatory tax on his radio, phonograph, or TV set.

In 1954 Congress reduced the manufacturers excise tax rate on practically all household items subject to the tax, but the 10 percent on radios, phonographs and TV sets remain. These products account for 43 percent of total sales. Yet they are the source of 59 percent of the revenue from all household items.

5. TV, radios, and phonographs are no longer luxuries, but necessities.

Radio and television as the major sources of information and entertainment today are essential to everyday life. Radios or phonographs are in 94 percent of U.S. homes and TV in 93 percent. Average TV families watch some 6½ hours daily; 70 percent of all men, 78 percent of all women and 99 percent of all children watch TV daily.

6. Radio and TV are "must" media in time of crisis.

They provide an unmatched communications system to the entire population in times of local or national emergency, for civil defense instruction, and for hurricane, tornado, and flood warnings. They were the first media to inform the people of such events of national importance as President Kennedy's assassination and the succeeding dramatic events; Presidential speeches on the Cuban and Vietnam crises, and vital messages to Congress and the Nation. More people are likely to hear of a major news event from radio than through any other medium of communication.

7. Radio and TV are optimum means for enlightenment, education, and cultural progress.

The most important key to national and international understanding is communication. Because of their intimacy and immediacy, radio and television stand supreme among all media of communications. Educational television (ETV) supplements and enhances classroom instruction and brings information and culture into the home. ETV, largely dependent on UHF broadcasting, is hampered by the higher cost of all-channel sets. Tax repeal would offset this deterrent to UHF development.

8. Radio and TV are major, mature media for news and special events.

A survey¹ reveals that TV is looked to for

¹ Elmo Roper & Associates Survey, 1964.

news more than any other medium, and that radio and TV are the most believable news sources. More than a third of the time spent by people viewing TV or listening to radio, even on the lowest educational level, was devoted to news and public affairs programs. Live coverage of the political conventions, the elections, the space launchings, the civil rights movement—all illustrate the vital role radio and TV play in keeping the American people informed.

A tax on television and radio is as contrary to wise public policy as a tax on newspapers and magazines would be.

9. Radio and TV are the most valued sources of entertainment.

Radios, phonographs and television are the principal means of entertainment for the entire family and particularly among the lower income families who are least able to pay the higher prices made necessary by the 10-percent excise tax. The American public, in a recent survey,² chose television ahead of radio, newspapers and magazines as the item they would least want to give up.

10. Revenue loss to the U.S. Treasury will be largely offset by business growth.

The combined radio and television manufacturing and broadcast industries employ over a million people. Increased sales brought about by excise tax repeal on radios, phonographs and television will increase employment and plant expansion in manufacturing and distribution and will open new areas of opportunity to broadcasting.

Color television is on the threshold of becoming a billion-dollar industry and the all-channel law is encouraging UHF broadcasting. The effect of excise tax repeal in these areas and in general on the electronics industry, the Nation's fifth largest, can have no other result than to stimulate the flow of the economy, thereby offsetting to a large extent any tax revenues lost to the Treasury.

² Elmo Roper & Associates Survey, 1964.

Rutgers Degrees: 41,410 in 20 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, Rutgers University, one of the Nation's oldest educational institutions and one rich in tradition and accomplishments, is now marking the 20th anniversary of its designation as the State University of New Jersey. I wish to bring to my colleagues' attention the outstanding work this great university has been doing on behalf of the community, State, and Nation.

Rutgers, nearly 200 years old, has developed numerous leaders in government, business, agriculture, journalism, and many other fields. Rutgers graduates can be found at the head or in the top echelons of many business enterprises. They have served their State and their country well.

Since becoming our State university, Rutgers, through enthusiastic public support, has grown and prospered in order to serve many more of our young people. Much more work is to be done, but we have gone far at Rutgers.

The Newark Evening News pointed out this week that Rutgers, the State university, has awarded advanced and under-

May 11, 1965

graduate degrees to 41,410 persons in the past 20 years, more than it had granted in all the previous 180 years in its history.

So that many more observers can be made aware of the great forward strides Rutgers University has made, I would like to insert in the Record this article published by the Newark Evening News:

UNIVERSITY'S EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES HAVE MUSHROOMED SINCE 1945: 41,410 RUTGERS DEGREES IN 20 YEARS

NEW BRUNSWICK.—Since passage of the State university act 20 years ago, Rutgers University has granted undergraduate and advanced degrees to 41,410 persons—more than were granted in all the previous 180 years of its history.

The act, approved March 28, 1945, extended the designation of State university to all units of Rutgers. It started the university expanding in the areas of enrollment programs, faculty and physical facilities which included acquisition of urban campuses in Newark and Camden.

The tangible results of this expansion are a quintupling of college credit students, construction of millions of dollars worth of new buildings, and enlarged opportunities for graduate and professional study.

"But beyond all this," according to Dr. Richard Schlatter, acting university president, "I believe there has been a growing realization of what a State university means to the educational, cultural, social and economic life of a State; that the investment in a university pays off in a richer and more productive community."

Commenting on the enlargement of the State university's educational offerings, Dr. Schlatter said Rutgers has organized a major educational, research or service unit almost annually since 1945.

DEGREE-GRANTING SCHOOLS

The university has established degree-granting schools in library service, social work, nursing and medicine. It recently has authorized establishment of a new coeducational undergraduate college at the former site of Camp Kilmer in neighboring Piscataway Township.

Also organized during this period have been units in management and labor relations, microbiology, practical politics, radiation science, information processing, animal behavior, statistics, urban affairs, alcohol studies, conservation and environmental science and community affairs.

Dr. Schlatter said that Rutgers scholarship and research have kept pace with its expansion in education and service units. Rutgers investment in sponsored research rose from \$763,000 in 1945 to \$8,505,000 in 1963.

"All of this would have been impossible without an outstanding faculty, including some scientists and scholars of national and even international reputation," he remarked.

Rutgers physical plant has grown tremendously in the last two decades. The university today has about 585 buildings located on 4,500 acres in New Brunswick, Newark, and Camden besides its research locations.

NEW CONSTRUCTION

A substantial part of this is new construction. Since 1953, \$118 million in new facilities have been built or planned throughout the State. A \$16.5 million medical school building and a \$16.3 million start for the new college in Piscataway are among projects on the drawing boards.

Dr. Schlatter said that two voter-endorsed bond issues for \$29.8 million in 1959 and for \$19 million last year plus \$19 million in State appropriations has provided the bulk of the financing for new construction at Rutgers.

"But despite all this expansion, the number of applicants we had to turn away this year has been larger than ever before," Dr. Schlatter said.

The State University Act of 1945 resulted from the study of the New Jersey Commission on State Administrative Reorganization. It was a high point of a State-Rutgers relationship which started before the Revolutionary War when the royal governor of the province was an ex officio member of the university's board of trustees.

Another high point in that relationship occurred 9 years ago when legislation was adopted creating a board of governors at the university. The board consists of 11 regular members and 2 ex officio members.

Six of the voting members are named by the Governor with the advice and consent of the State senate. Five are named by the Rutgers board of trustees which retain fiduciary and advisory functions. The university president and State education commissioners are the ex officio members.

Supplemental Appropriation for Military Functions of Department of Defense, Fiscal Year 1965

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 447) making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for military functions of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, cloaked in the disguise of a military appropriation bill, this House was asked to approve, and did approve, this Government's policy of escalating the war in southeast Asia. Six of my colleagues and I dissented.

Since it is conceded by everyone, including the President, that the \$700 million was not the issue at hand, then at a minimum, surely, in this body which the Speaker refers to as the greatest deliberative body in the world, there should be full discussion of what this resolution does mean while there is still time, hopefully, to resolve these tragic affairs before we bring down upon our heads the wrath of the world and shatter the frail edifice of world peace.

To my colleagues and my constituents I want to say that for many, many months now I have searched for every possible excuse to support my Government in the policies it is pursuing in Vietnam—and I have supported it. In spite of the shaky logic of the "domino" theory, I have done by very best to believe in it; in spite of the fact that the people of South Vietnam have been subjected to one unpopular and unstable dictatorship after another, I have done my best to believe we are defending their freedom; in spite of the fact that we have violated the Geneva accords, I have done my best to believe this was justified because the North Vietnamese did also, even though I know that two wrongs do not make a right; in spite of one humiliating military defeat after another, I have done by best to believe all the optimistic reports about our really winning

the war over there; in spite of all the evidence of internal discord and revolt against the governments we maintain in power, I have done my best to believe this is what the Vietnamese people really want us to do—but, my fellow Americans, there is a point beyond which credibility simply will not stretch—and it is that somehow by waging a wider war we pursue a policy of peace.

This vote represented, in my opinion, a vote for that delusion. It could not have been a vote for \$700 million, for the President himself said this was available in any case. It could not have been a vote to show our united determination to halt Communist aggression, for if more than a decade of effort, more than 400 American lives, more than \$3 billion expended does not show this, then how can \$700 million demonstrate it?

One of the things the vote could mean, though, is what in fact everyone knows it will be interpreted to mean, and that is Congressional approval for the continued bombings of North Vietnam and commitment of thousands and thousands of American troops to a war the justice and wisdom of which has been questioned inside and outside this Nation by citizens and friends of unimpeachable loyalty. I think it also clearly means the relinquishment by Congress of its constitutional authority to declare war, for if the President can direct bombing raids on North Vietnam by simple executive fiat, why can he not direct similar action against any other nation at any other time? Why bother to ask? Once the bomb is dropped, it can always be pointed out that rightly or wrongly—legally or illegally—we are in a war and that American lives are at stake and that it would be disloyal to not approve funds for the war.

I cannot in good conscience lend my self to that kind of usurpation of congressional power, and for the purpose of continuing a course of action which I believe will only reap at best, decades of hostility, enmity, and distrust of our countrymen by the peoples of Asia or, a worst, utter catastrophe for my Nation and the world.

Yet but an hour and a half debate was allotted for discussion of a measure which profoundly affects the future of our country and the world, and less than 15 minutes of that time was given to those who might have reservations, who might have questions, who might disagree. I find it impossible to understand why an admittedly unnecessary appropriation request need be mantled in a cloak of urgency and secret meaning with full, free, and frank discussion of its merits denied.

The high point of these whole implausible proceedings was the speech of one of my colleagues who, in one breath, demanded withdrawal of Government funds to an educational project, because some of the participants criticized administration policy in Vietnam and then, in the next breath, he admiringly quotes Senator Vandenberg's statement that:

Every foreign policy must be totally debated, and the loyal opposition is under special obligation to see that this occurs,

And this in the context of demanding for himself and others of the minority

party a voice in foreign policy decisions. His exact quote is:

These teach-ins are a protest against the national policy of our country. It seems to me that when we have individuals conducting these teach-ins and acting as leaders in these groups, that it is not in the best interests of the national security of our country for our Government to subsidize this kind of operation by financing projects in which these same people play a prominent role.

I can see we are all going to have an absorbing year if we follow the advice of the gentleman from Wisconsin, making certain we do not subsidize free inquiry, but only subsidize thought control.

And yet, I wonder if any policy, domestic or foreign, which its supporters here in this House are unwilling to risk to the judgment of free and inquiring minds can prove anything except on the part of its advocates, an abysmal lack of confidence in its strength. Surely a policy in which one believes deeply can stand examination and discussion.

Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, our national neighbor, Canada, is one of our best friends and our best customer, ranking first in purchases of U.S. goods. Yet, in general, we are too uninformed about our neighbor. As a nation, we should have more knowledge about Canada. Mark Ethridge, Jr., the distinguished son of a distinguished father, writing for the Detroit Free Press of which paper he is an associate editor, has in a series of four articles attempted to increase our knowledge. The first article follows:

RIVALRY HURTS AS CANADA SEEKS IDENTITY—HERITAGE AND U.S. WEALTH RULE A DIVIDED NATION

(NOTE.—Geographically and culturally divided, rich in resources yet economically dominated by her giant neighbor to the south, Canada is struggling for a national identity. Free Press associate editor Mark Ethridge Jr., in a four-part series beginning today, puts a new perspective on the personalities and problems, the advances and the setbacks, and the directions the struggle is likely to take.)

(By Mark Ethridge, Jr.)

One hundred years ago, Canadians began a search for independence that culminated in the British North America Act of 1867.

Today they are beginning a search for identity, and where it will lead no one yet can tell for sure. The only certainty is that even after 100 years of freedom from British control, Canadians still don't have it.

"Given a chance to adopt French culture, British government and American technology," a Toronto editor said recently, "Canadians settled for French government, American culture, and British technology."

Accurate or not, the three most dominant influences on the life of Canada are the two nations of its heritage and big daddy to the south—the United States. To each there

are ties of blood and money as well as strains of resentment.

So strong are each of these that Canadians have not yet created a society, an economy or a culture which could be classified as native Canadian.

With the adoption of a flag this year as the most evident symbol this is precisely what Canadians are trying to do. Whether they will succeed is still to be determined.

By an odd paradox Canada's three greatest assets—land wealth, a high standard of living and indomitable courage—are also its three greatest handicaps.

Canada's land mass is the second largest in the world, only after Russia, and it covers more than 3½ million square miles. Considering that the population of Canada is less than 20 million, this gives it one of the highest land-to-population ratios in the world, a standard economic index of wealth and potential.

But the land is not divided right for the most efficient development along Canadian lines. Its mountains, as in the United States, run mostly north and south. Except for the St. Lawrence Seaway, which separates the United States and Canada from Duluth almost to Montreal—and then divides Canada itself—its river also run the wrong way. The ones that don't flow into Hudson Bay or the Arctic flow south into the United States.

Thus the natural geographic ties are not east and west, but north and south. The plains of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta have more in common with the Dakotas and Montana than they have with the maritime provinces.

The Maritimes, in turn, are linked closely with New England, and British Columbia, on the west, considers Washington and Oregon its natural allies.

Only the heartland, Ontario, is central enough and highly developed enough to concentrate on being Canadian. And industrialized Ontario is economically tied to the United States. We are Canada's best customer, just as Canada is our best customer.

This is paradox No. 2. Canada's high standard of living is a product of U.S. investment in Canada, but it also means that Canadian industry does not have an identity of its own. Canada is dependent on the United States, while at the same time competing with us.

This kind of relationship, said a highly respected editor of a Canadian financial newspaper, "is like the rich man playing poker with his chauffeur—after he's beggared the poor man he has to bail him out."

"The best we can hope for is that this match, too, will be fixed."

And the third paradox is Canadian courage, one not delineated by national origin. It is what enables a Canadian to tolerate the rigors of a northern winter or to stand up to the United States.

But the same quality that makes Canadians fearless also makes them stubborn. Like Americans of 100 years ago, most put the province ahead of the nation. Rather than cede a point to another section, they seem willing to risk the dissolution of their country into its five natural, geographic, and cultural entities—British Columbia, the prairies, Ontario, Quebec, and the Maritimes.

At the emotional center of this divisive quarrel is Quebec, where proud and provincial French Canadians never have forgotten that France lost her power in North America because of a British victory there in 1759.

Quebec does not really care to be Canadian. It wants to be French. If it is possible to be both French and Canadian, Quebecois are willing, though.

Since Quebec's 5 million people make up 28 percent of Canada's population, they constitute a minority which cannot be ignored. To keep them happy, the Federal Government has had to make concessions which intensify rather than temper the dividing process.

Prime Minister Lester Pearson, operating

in Ottawa with a government made up of less than a majority, has been pressured to back down on centralization of government and to grant provincial premiers such independent authority over their affairs as would scare a U.S. governor witless.

While these provincial powers have permitted each part of the nation to strengthen itself in its own way, they have not served as a unifying force. Unlike the United States, Canada is not a melting pot. It is a collection of ethnic, economic, and religious islands separated by vast stretches of undeveloped land.

Because Canada is divided into five separate and distinct areas, and because each has more independence than any comparable U.S. area, the Canadian economy also is fractionated. In general, in terms of gross national product and the export market, it is booming. But it is uneven, more so than the assorted economies of the 50 United States.

Ontario and Quebec are enjoying the greatest prosperity in their history. Ontario, long the industrial leader of Canada, is seeing new plants spring up every day. Toronto, Canada's second largest city, is nearly the size of Detroit.

Montreal, the first city of Canada and the world's largest French city after Paris, is almost exploding with prosperity. In the center, across the street from the sprawling Queen Elizabeth Hotel, is the Place Ville de Marie, a remarkable underground International Village where a visitor can find imports from almost everywhere and dine at restaurants recapturing a Paris bistro or a backyard barbecue in Albuquerque.

Dorval, Montreal's new airport is not so large as Kennedy International, but its architecture is more imaginative and the service is better than anything in the United States.

And its planes are on time.

Montreal currently is, engaged in great plans for Expo 67, an international exposition to mark the 100th birthday of Canadian independence.

Canada itself plans to spend \$21 million on its national pavilion and exhibit, and total \$167 million. More than 50 nations, including the United States and Russia, have promised to participate.

"We will move heaven and earth to insure that no visitor, participating nation or private exhibitor is gouged," says Robert F. Shaw, deputy commissioner of the exposition. "We want to build up enduring relations, both with the countries participating and with the guests who will visit us in 1967, and the way to do that is to make sure that they get good value for their money."

To the east and south of Quebec, the Maritime Provinces—Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Newfoundland—are the Appalachia of Canada, cramped, economically depressed, losing population, hindered by lack of ready access to the outside world.

The prairie Provinces, like our Great Plains, still are tied to a farm economy with its resultant boom and bust cycles. Last year was a boom time, but next year—or any year—could be a disaster. The prairies are trying desperately and in competition with each other, to diversify by developing their ore deposits.

British Columbia has the same problem of economic development that plagues Washington and Oregon—the familiar footnote in the ad which says, "Slightly higher west of the Rockies." Transportation is, expensive, especially in a land whose population is spread out in a strip more than 3,000 miles long but only 200 miles deep. British Columbia is the end of the line.

Inflamed by the irritant of Quebec, inspired by dreams of new authority, provincial rivalry has become so intense that many Canadians would rather buy abroad than from another Province. According to U.S. News & World Report, economic studies show

May 11, 1965

that Canadians will spend up to 15 percent more to support local industries rather than "imports" from other Provinces.

The executive of a Canadian firm is quoted as saying, "We find it more difficult to sell our products today in some of the Provinces of our own country than in Algeria and Venezuela."

He might not be typical of the majority of Canadian industrialists, but there can be little question that the essence of his lament is real. Canadians, doing better than ever before, don't feel they need each other as they once did.

There can be even less question that the source of this feeling, the irritant which keeps Canada from finding a national identity 100 years after the search began, is Quebec.

The Role of the OAS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ELIGIO DE LA GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, the strife, turmoil, and bloodshed in the Dominican Republic in the last few days points up once again the continuous Communist subversion dictated from Moscow and Peiping and implemented from Havana.

Every American should be proud of the swift action of President Johnson in taking those measures necessary to insure that communism shall not spread to another freedom-loving people in our own hemisphere.

The issues in the Dominican Republic crisis are clear. Shall a small band of foreign-trained subversives defy the will of the people, their constituted representatives and their national neighbors, or shall the combined moral and political forces of the republics of the Western Hemisphere be brought to bear?

The United States has a clear answer. President Johnson gave that answer in his address to the Nation when he said:

The United States is ready to support with every resource at its command the inter-American system.

I am proud of the determination which the President displayed to the world. I am proud too of the strong support which the American press has given to our foreign policy decisions. The editors of our Nation have done an excellent service in clarifying the issues and printing informative explanations of the nature of the U.S. commitment to fight communism anywhere in the world. The May 5 editorial from the Washington Evening Star is a sample of that support.

This editorial follows:

THE ROLE OF THE OAS

When the crisis in the Dominican Republic reached the point at which the governing junta advised our officials that it could not guarantee the safety of U.S. citizens and those of other countries, President Johnson acted promptly and firmly. When information came through which persuaded him that the revolt against the junta was being taken under Communist control, he again acted promptly and firmly. Additional thousands of marines and paratroopers were rushed to the Caribbean country. And this

was the right thing to do. As a result our nationals and the others have adequate protection, large quantities of much-needed food and medical supplies are getting through, and the fighting for practical purposes is over. All of this adds up to a good day's work for Lyndon Baines Johnson, and we applaud his willingness to act decisively when delay might have been fatal. Once a decision has been made to intervene in a situation like this, it is vital that the intervention be effective.

Still, the American people should not deceive themselves. There is much that remains to be done, and the doing of it may be more difficult than sending in the marines and the paratroopers. Those who worry about our image say that the United States has suffered because of this exercise in gunboat diplomacy. To the extent that this may be true, and we do not believe there is much truth in it, the fact remains that, under the circumstances, damage to our image was greatly to be preferred to the slaughter of American citizens or a Communist takeover in the Dominican Republic. On this point it is significant that the complainants, whether in the Senate, the United Nations, or Latin America, have failed to come up with a plan for a better course of action, or, in fact, with any proposal at all for an alternative. The truth is that the President had no alternative, except to do nothing and accept what promised to be frightful consequences.

The stage has now been reached, however, at which all parties should join in the search for a political solution. In this connection the best hope lies with the Organization of American States, which has had a peace-seeking commission in Santo Domingo for several days.

It seems to us the OAS will do well to concentrate its efforts on securing a cease-fire in Santo Domingo followed by establishment of an interim provisional government there. If it proves possible meanwhile to replace our troops with an inter-American force, so much the better. But there is less value in justifying the steps already taken to restore order in the island than there is in searching out a solution to the problem of the political future.

After negotiations with both factions in Santo Domingo, an OAS spokesman is reported as saying that a great deal of progress toward a solution of the crisis has been made. Since no details were forthcoming, this should be put down as a generality, but a hopeful one. On the other side of the ledger, U.S. authorities are reported to have said they are determined to make sure that all measures will be taken to eliminate any danger of a Communist takeover before American troops leave the island.

Again, what we have here is a generality, but one which is in line with the President's newly proclaimed doctrine that no new Communist regime will be tolerated in the Americas.

All of this, it seems to us, suggests that the role of the peacemakers will not be an easy one. Our troops may be in the Dominican Republic for quite a while. In the end, however, there must come an acceptable settlement, and it is most likely to be achieved through the good offices of the OAS.

Rumanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in

commemorating Rumanian Independence Day.

Twenty years ago—a generation—Soviet military might thrust a crown of thorns on the brow of Rumania. Since that time the people of Rumania have suffered under the domination of a Communist totalitarian regime.

In recent years there have, happily, been signs that the oppression slowly is being lifted. No longer does the Soviet Union maintain its military garrisons on Rumanian soil.

Recently too, the Rumanian Government has demonstrated some independence from Moscow, and has expressed a desire for better relations with the West.

These efforts at breaking the grip of Soviet communism over a people are to be applauded. Let us hope that they presage even further advances toward restoring freedoms to the Rumanian people.

While no concession should be made any regime in Eastern Europe which would endanger our national security or solidify the position of Communist rulers, the United States should continue to work for the betterment of the Rumanian people.

In this effort, it may be possible to explore increased trade, cultural and trade relations between people of the United States and the people of Rumania. In this way it eventually may be possible to assist the reentry of Rumania into the family of European nations.

It is that glorious time we look toward today as we commemorate Rumanian Independence Day.

REA in Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEC G. OLSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, perhaps no congressional district in the Nation can testify more directly and convincingly of benefits derived from the Rural Electrification Administration than the Sixth Congressional District of Minnesota. Since the beginning of the rural electrification program in 1935, REA has helped to light the homes and ease the labors of farm people in rural areas of the 19 counties in this district.

In this great agricultural area, REA has been a boon to farm and village residents and to the city dwellers who have cottages near our fine lakes or in our wooded sections. Today, there are 13 rural electric cooperatives which maintain their headquarters facilities within the Sixth Congressional District, and 6 others which serve sections of counties in the Sixth District. In addition, there are eight REA telephone borrowers which have headquarters within this congressional district.

The 13 rural electric borrowers are operating a total of 19,664 miles of electric powerlines and they serve 53,044 rural consumers. One of these borrow-

consideration the bill (H.R. 7657) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces and for other purposes.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, as one of the newest members of the House Committee on the Armed Services, I would like to take this opportunity to express my sentiments about the excellent manner in which my chairman presented the \$15 billion military procurement bill in the House.

It was another demonstration of the effective leadership he has exhibited since assuming the chair of the committee upon the retirement of the Honorable Carl Vinson, who served as chairman so long and well. We who are freshmen on the Armed Services Committee will look to L. MENDELL RIVERS for continued leadership of the same high caliber.

President's Order on the Dominican Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, because of the numerous statements being issued daily on the President's order dispatching our military personnel to the Dominican Republic, I should like to insert in the RECORD a recent editorial from the Pittsburgh Press, April 29, 1965, on this subject.

As the Press has so ably stated, the President is working and acting in behalf of our citizens. Were he to ignore their plight, there is a possibility that not only the Americans in the Dominican Republic would suffer. Other Americans—within our own borders—could feel the effects of our Nation's disregard of rebellions, even small ones, so close to our shores.

The President's action was well taken, I believe—and future events will so prove it.

The editorial follows:

SENDING THE MARINES

President Johnson's timely action in sending U.S. Marines to protect U.S. citizens in a friendly neighboring country torn by armed strife is well taken—as is his urgent new plea for warring factions within the Dominican Republic to cease fire.

The President ordered the Marines into the island Republic only after new fighting had broken out and Dominican military authorities advised that U.S. military aid was needed to guarantee the safety of American citizens.

The political situation within the Dominican Republic remains unclear. The Dominican Ambassador to the Organization of American States contends efforts to overthrow the Government were the "finalization of Communist plans to make the Dominican Republic a second Cuba."

Our troops are officially in the Caribbean nation to guard U.S. citizens and foreign nationals who ask our protection. But high officials in Washington feel that we had an-

other purpose in landing marines—to checkmate an attempt by Cuba's Communist dictator, Castro, to extend his sway.

If that is true, it is welcome evidence that the United States is willing to take a firmer stand than it has in the past in blocking subversive activity that threatens the peace and good order of friendly nations in Latin America.

Law Day in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, one of our very able jurists in Minnesota, the Honorable Donald Barbeau, judge of the district court of Hennepin County, was the principal speaker in Law Day ceremonies held in the city council chambers in the city of Minneapolis on April 29, 1965.

His message is brief but eloquent. Law Day is every day for the conscientious jurist who must exercise constant vigilance to see that the rights of all those who come before him are protected.

Because this message speaks so clearly of this continuing role of those administering justice, under unanimous consent, I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

LAW DAY U.S.A.—EVERY DAY U.S.A.

(An address delivered by the Honorable Donald T. Barbeau, judge of the district court, at Law Day ceremonies in the city council chambers, at 9:30 a.m., Apr. 29, 1965)

While I greatly admire the setting aside of a particular day each year as Law Day to reaffirm the American belief in law and peace as opposed to the totalitarian belief in armed might, I must point out that those of us closely connected with the law must and do practice Law Day every day of the year.

The people who appear in our courts come from all levels of society, rich and poor, educated and uneducated, man, woman, and child, of all races and creeds, the poverty stricken and the affluent, the alcoholic, the mental misfit, all reaching out for an American way of justice administered in an equitable manner.

We jurists think of Law Day every day when we ascend the bench and see before us the poor and downtrodden and persons by the thousands burdened with almost insurmountable problems of existence.

We see Law Day every day when the American system of justice is able to extend itself and apprise each of these persons of his rights, protect his constitutional privileges and give each and every one an opportunity to express himself. Above all, we see it when the American system of justice is able to furnish help and succor to many of these citizens who are enmeshed in problems beyond their control.

We think of Law Day every day when we see the great legal advocate rise to defend these same impoverished people, regardless of how unpopular or impossible the cause may be, and when he carries such cause to the highest court in the land, not always with success, but always with sincerity.

What bulwark would freedom or the innocent unjustly accused of crime have if none had the courage to defend?

We think of Law Day every day when we consider the judge who, to quote Socrates, "hears courteously, answers wisely, considers

soberly, and decides impartially." We think daily of the courts as being the guardians of liberty and the sentinels who watch for the capricious, the corrupt, the arbitrary, and the automatic. We see it every day in the conduct of the trial judge who feels it is his duty to do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with his God.

The citizen, the advocate, and the judge, all working together daily, must convince the entire world that we have the finest form of justice. This can be done by the daily guarding of our precious heritage and a daily reaffirmation of our belief in the dignity of man because freedom itself demands constant vigilance. We must all daily dedicate ourselves to fighting for freedom for "the man next door." So to us who sit as judges "the rule of right, not might" is a living, vibrant thought that must be present day in and day out.

The American system of justice, though not perfect, is the marvel of the modern world. Under it we have grown and progressed and become the richest and most powerful Nation in the world.

But more important than that, today in our country the lowliest person under our flag enjoys a broader opportunity to possess happiness, more equal justice, more protection of life, liberty and property, and a greater personal freedom than has ever been provided for the common man by any other legal system in recorded history.

Under present world conditions, with all of us so concerned lest nations and peoples, forgetting law and morality, turn to mutual destruction, we need all the more every day, as well as Law Day, to work for a day when law may govern nations as it does men within nations.

Thoughtful persons do not need to be told that our Government cannot long exist once respect for the law is destroyed. Any apathy or indifference to the great rights of American justice may deprive us of many of them.

It is most proper, therefore, that on Law Day U.S.A. and every other day we rededicate ourselves to the idea of the preservation of a free society with equality and justice for all.

His Victory Our Loss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed emotions that I heard last week of the official election as international vice president of the United Steelworkers of America of my dear friend, Joseph P. Molony of Buffalo. For while I and countless of my fellow citizens in Erie County are gratified and proud that our neighbor, Joe Molony, has been elevated by his brother steelworkers to the second highest post in the Nation's third largest trade union, we stand to lose a wonderful member of our civic community.

Much has been written in recent years about the development of the so-called "union bureaucrat," Mr. Speaker, and there have been those both within and without the house of labor who have spoken sharply about the leadership of the American trade union movement. Some have suggested that their former ideals and aspirations have been shelved in favor of personal gain and power.

There is no question but that this has been the case in many unions, but it is indeed refreshing to know that three decades in the labor movement, through both good and bad days, have not changed the principals and standards of Joe Molony, who has earned the respect and the admiration of leading industrialists, statesmen and civic leaders.

Our neighbor and friend, Joe Molony, has been saluted in the Wall Street Journal for his determination and resolution to seek the fruits of the American way of life for the some 1 million members of the United Steelworkers. He is indeed in the tradition of Phillip Murray, the beloved founder of his union, and of the other great figures of the American trade union movement.

Mr. Speaker, if there is no objection, I would like to insert the following editorial tribute which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News on May 4, 1965:

HIS VICTORY OUR LOSS

Now that the election of the Abel-Molony ticket of the United Steel Workers is official even though the result is not conceded by incumbent President David J. McDonald, we congratulate the winners. But especially so to "Joe" Molony, who is known in Buffalo not only as a forthright and courageous and intelligent labor man but as a civic leader. As such he has been enlisted on the side of good government in Buffalo and Erie County.

Ed Kelly, our respected labor reporter, advises that Mr. Molony's election as vice president of United Steel Workers doubtless means he will have to move himself and his headquarters to Pittsburgh, the center of activity for the million-member Steel Workers Union. This will be a gain for the steel workers, we believe, but it will be a serious loss in the political areas in which Mr. Molony has been active and has made his voice heard and judgment felt in this community. There are those who will be glad to see him go. We are not among them.

Laotian National Day, May 11

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on May 11, 1947, Laos promulgated its first constitution. This constitution was to become a kind of modern statute for the kingdom, which received its independence from France 2 years later. In Laos, May 11 has been designated National Day and today is the 18th anniversary of that important and historic occasion.

I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate His Majesty King Sri Savang Vatthana, His Royal Highness Prime Minister Souvanna Phouma, and His Royal Highness, the Laotian Ambassador to the United States, Prince Tiao Khampan.

It is an appropriate time to turn our attention to the Kingdom of Laos. There is a tendency for our eyes to focus on the developments in South Vietnam and to ignore what is happening in Laos. Yet Laos, as much as its neighbor to the south, is deeply engaged in a grim struggle

for survival. Both countries are waging a war against Communist subversion and penetration.

The front pages of newspapers are filled with reports from South Vietnam—about the most recent air strike against a Vietcong stronghold or the arrival of a new contingent of marines. On rare occasions a column or two on Laos may appear in an inside page. In Laos there is none of the tempo or drama of the conflict in South Vietnam. Perhaps, for this reason, it is often called "the quiet war."

We should not forget, however, that the struggles in Laos and South Vietnam are indivisible. The leaders in Hanoi are masterminding both offensives and their goal in each case is the same. Their aim is clear and unmistakable—to bring the people of both countries under Communist domination.

A year ago the Communist Pathet Lao were rapidly gaining ground and the Royal Lao government, as represented by its neutralist and right wings, was falling apart. Indeed, it seemed that Laos was almost lost. The last 12 months, however, have seen some remarkable changes. Prime Minister Souvanna Phouma has consolidated his power and is for the moment confident and prepared to battle with the Communist guerrillas.

It would be unwise to exaggerate the importance of these gains. On the 18th anniversary of its "national day" the kingdom of Laos faces a difficult and dangerous future. In the year to come each day will be a test of the people's strength and will to survive. We in the United States honor these democratic and freedom-loving people. Their courage in these days of crisis assures them of the continued close support of the American people.

The President's Agonizing Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following column by Max Lerner which was reprinted in the New York Herald Tribune of May 10, 1965 by the International Latex Corp.

Mr. Lerner has put his finger directly on one of the tremendous problems facing our President.

The article follows:

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S AGONIZING CHOICE

(NOTE.—The following article from the pen of a renowned political liberal, a distinguished scholar and widely read columnist, sheds light where so much heat is now being generated. Reason and fact are used here to counter the confusions born of passion and noise.)

(We are convinced that Mr. Max Lerner's article should be read by Americans and Latin Americans alike; and by those who find strange comfort in criticizing President Johnson for his courageous decisions in the Dominican Republic disaster.

(A. N. Spanel, founder chairman, International Latex Corp.)

A friend of mine, who knows Latin America better than I do, says it will be a long, hot summer in the Caribbean. Certainly what has happened in Santo Domingo, turning a lovely city into a charnel house, suggests that there are volcanic political passions in the area. The bloodshed wears the aspect not only of a rebellion but of a civil war, with longstanding hatreds coming into play and old accounts being settled.

In this jungle of passions, anti-American hatreds emerged very early in the rebellion. President Johnson had to act swiftly to get American civilians out. But most political decisions have plural, not single, motives. Having entered the Dominican Republic to save lives, the American troops have stayed to prevent anarchy, seal off the chances of a Communist takeover, and await the beginnings of a new frame of political order.

One's first impulse is to say that this was a monstrous blunder, awakening long muted memories of marine landings and gunboat diplomacy, and feeding the Castro image of American imperialism. Yet one cannot stop there, without raising a haunting question: What was the alternative for President Johnson? Was it to appeal to the OAS? There would be days and days before any practical action; and if the revolt did indeed contain, as a second-stage effect, the design for a Communist takeover, the OAS action would have come far too late. Or was the alternative simply to stay out, or to get out again immediately after the first evacuation of Americans, and let events take their course?

It isn't enough to point out in a holler-than-they way what must have been obvious enough to Johnson, Rusk, Bundy, and Tom Mann—that the decision was a dangerous one. But was there any alternative that would have been any less dangerous? Running a country isn't a question of making choices between the beautiful decisions and the damned ones. It is often an impossible choice between a blind alley and a somewhat less blind one, and a President is lucky, even as he enters a dark tunnel, that he can see a thin shaft of light at the far end.

The whole decision in the Dominican operation, as it transpired in the minds of the President and his advisers, was made in the shadow of Cuba. It is easy to say that the shadow shouldn't have been there—but it was. Too much blood has been spilt in Cuba, too many lives have been blasted there, too much heartbreak and frustration and remorse have been felt in Washington to leave the slate blank.

The pro-Bosch leaders now say that the Communist elements in the revolt are not many, and that the irresponsible ones got out of control. Maybe so. Certainly Bosch himself is a decent committed democrat with a small d, even if he is an ineffectual political leader. But after the Castro experience should one have expected President Johnson to take a course of action—or nonaction—that might well have led to a second Cuba off American shores? For him to have done so would not only have been out of character an out of philosophy; it would also have run counter to the kind of President most of the American people think he is, and the kind of belief they have in him.

Well, then, once the American troops came in, why has President Johnson piled up more and more thousands of them? Isn't each detachment he sends a further slap at the Latin American self-image? Here again one must go back to Cuban-American history, this time to the Bay of Pigs. The shadow of the Bay of Pigs fiasco hangs even more heavily over Washington than the shadow of Castro's persistence in power. If the Bay of Pigs invasion was a mistake then—as everyone now agrees—the failure to carry it through in full force compounded the mistake many times over. That was in Ken-

nedy's mind when he had to make a decision on the Russian missiles in Cuba. It will be in the mind of every President for some years to come. If history is lights and shadows, it is mostly shadows.

Of course there has been an outcry from the Latin neighbors and partners of the United States. If I were a Brazilian, a Mexican, a Chilean, I should probably be joining in the outcry. Yet if I asked myself what alternative there was, I should have no answer. I suspect strongly that, however great the outcry has been, it would have been dim and pale alongside the withering contempt of the Latin American leaders if the United States had done nothing, if its citizens had been killed, and if the revolt had led to another Castro regime—or a Castro-oriented one—in Santo Domingo.

The satisfying fact is that the OAS political presence has been enabled to establish itself alongside the U.S. military presence. There are dead, to be buried, wounds to be bound up, food to be distributed, the routines of life to be restored. A new leadership will in time be found, and with heavy economic aid it will be able to make a new beginning of order. Whatever may be said against the Americans, they will not stay any longer than the minimal need for them. They will get out. That would not have been true of the Castroites, if they had been given a chance to turn the rebellion into a class dictatorship.

A Tribute to Congressman Frank Annunzio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week our colleague from Chicago, Congressman FRANK ANNUNZIO, was honored by the Filippo Mazzei Post No. 1, Illinois, of the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, for his outstanding contribution in behalf of veterans legislation.

I should like to call my colleagues' attention to the fine tribute given Mr. ANNUNZIO and also to include his own remarks delivered in Chicago on Loyalty Day, May 1, 1965. We can all find great inspiration in Mr. ANNUNZIO's eloquent words regarding Loyalty Day.

Mr. Speaker, the two documents follow:

A TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN FRANK ANNUNZIO

(By Dr. James F. Greco, commander, Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.)

We are pleased to have with us this evening the distinguished Congressman from the Seventh Congressional District of the State of Illinois, Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO. We welcome him as a friend; but his presence here tonight is of even greater significance—he is a champion of veterans everywhere.

From his earliest beginnings, Congressman ANNUNZIO's interest in civic affairs has prompted him to work for and with the people—recognizing their needs and their deeds—filling those needs and praising their deeds.

A look at the long, impressive list of his accomplishments makes one wonder how one

man could have done so much. His driving vitality earned him a bachelor of arts degree and a master's degree from DePaul University. He entered the teaching profession and guided students in many of our Chicago schools.

As a fighter for human rights, he was in the trenches many years ago. After he was named director of labor in 1949, he issued a bulletin which drastically eliminated discrimination in employment services. He continually worked for the educational and legislative betterment of the labor community.

For his service to the Catholic Youth Organization, FRANK received the CYO Bishop Shell Medal—Club of Champions. His fostering of good relations between Italy and the United States impelled the Italian Government to award him the Medal of Solidarity during the crucial period of World War II.

Even in private business FRANK found time to be part and parcel of a multitude of civic and charitable organizations. And just to prove this man is human, he is married and the father of three lovely girls. To his four grandsons, he is simply and affectionally "Grandpa."

FRANK typifies the expression, "Service before self," and he is not a man who is satisfied to go on past performance. His projected plans for the future include the procurement of a congressional charter for the national organization, the establishment of a national shrine for Italian-American War Veterans. He has been instrumental in securing a 40-bed hospital on the West Side of Chicago which will be built in 1966.

On March 12 of this year, we were honored to have FRANK represent the Filippo Mazzei Post at the ceremonies at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and at the wreath-laying ceremony at the Kennedy gravesite in Arlington Cemetery.

And so this evening we feel it particularly fitting that we present Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO with the flag of the country he is serving so well. May it long stand in his office in Washington as a reminder of the high esteem in which he is held by his friends of the Filippo Mazzei Post.

LOYALTY DAY

(By Congressman FRANK ANNUNZIO)

I am very happy to be here with you tonight and very honored to be invited to share your observance of Loyalty Day. In March 1961 the late Senator Wiley, of Wisconsin, predicted that our country during the 1960's will face "threats to our security and survival greater than ever before in our history." In this spring of 1965, the truth of his words is becoming appallingly apparent. Never has our country had greater need of our loyalty, and never has there been a time, more urgent in its demand, for all Americans to step forward and give expression to their loyalty.

I did two things when I first began to think of speaking to you tonight. I looked up the dictionary's definition of loyalty, and I looked back over the history of Loyalty Day in order to review it briefly with you. From time to time, our office has been asked what is Loyalty Day, how it does differ from Law Day, and why are they both celebrated on the same day.

Loyalty, according to Mr. Webster, is the state, quality, or instance of being loyal, and one of the definitions of loyalty is "being faithful to the lawful government."

In 1961, the chairman of Loyalty Day of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Thomas B. Dean, published an article entitled "Loyalty Day—Americanism in Action." It appeared in the VFW magazine, and in it he reviewed the beginnings of Loyalty Day. He wrote:

"When the Communists in the United States flaunted their anti-American beliefs with the visual aid of annual May 1 parade

in the heart of New York City, the VFW paraded this strategy with the sponsorship of another parade—this one dedicated to the spirit of Americanism. Subsequently the May 1 parade by Communists in New York became a memory."

Loyalty Day then was the idea of a veteran's organization, whose members had fought on land and sea. It was the brainchild of men who knew the horrors of war and who were determined that all people of this country should understand the sacrifices of war and rededicate themselves to a love of country which these fighting men had demonstrated in the past.

The idea was enthusiastically received. The American Legion and numerous other groups joined in celebrating Loyalty Day in State after State, city after city. Then Governor after Governor in all the States joined the list of those proclaiming May 1 as Loyalty Day.

In 1955, Congress by a special proclamation designated May 1, 1955, as Loyalty Day, and 3 years later the Congress officially designated May 1 of each year as Loyalty Day.

The resolution was introduced in Congress by Mr. Van Zandt in the House, who said he did it at the request of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. He offered an explanation of why May 1 was chosen, when he said:

"The idea of a patriotic celebration is an excellent means of countering communism. May Day demonstrations were conceived * * * about 30 years ago. It was agreed that emphasis should be placed on and attention focused on loyal Americans rather than subversive elements * * * (and that the day should be) dedicated to openly expressing loyalty to our Nation and its cherished ideals of liberty and freedom. In short, the virtues of true Americanism were given the public spotlight as a fitting and conclusive rebuttal to the vaunted claims of the Communists."

The joint resolution requested the President to order the flag to be displayed on Government buildings and to invite the people to observe Loyalty Day with appropriate ceremonies.

In the same year that Congress designated May 1 as Loyalty Day, President Eisenhower proclaimed May 1 as Law Day, and 3 years later Congress by joint resolution officially designated May 1 of each year as Law Day. The result is that we celebrate both Law Day and Loyalty Day on May 1, but no one has ever suggested that the two observances on the same day conflict in any manner.

If you recall with me the definition of loyal as "being faithful to the lawful government," you will see why no question was ever asked. However, the newspaper, The Stars and Stripes, on May 1, 1958, carried an editorial on "Law and Loyalty," which summarized the affinity of the 2 days as follows:

"Fortunately the ideas do not conflict. Dedication to the principles of government under law and loyalty to our country go hand in hand. Proper observance of the law brings of itself loyalty to the country and loyalty to the country must result in recognition of law which governs the people."

A good citizen obeys the law and is loyal to his country. A loyal man is faithful to the lawful government. America today is being challenged by a ruthless world and by countries without principles who are dedicated only to the will to conquer and to accomplish world domination. I thank you for this opportunity to join with you in this Loyalty Day observance to demonstrate to the world that we in America are free and friendly and dedicated to the proposition that all men should be free and friendly, and in addition, we are united as one people living loyally under law.

Reds Learn L.B.J.'s Tough**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. J. J. PICKLE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, all Americans can point with pride to the dynamic leadership of President Johnson in the field of foreign affairs.

We in America—and especially we Members of Congress—have long admired the President for his ingenious insight into the domestic problems that confront our people. We have seen him cope with these complex problems with an amazing ability and outstanding effectiveness.

But only in recent weeks has the world learned of the leadership greatness of Lyndon B. Johnson. This Nation's recent actions in Vietnam and in Central America have focused the world spotlight on our courageous Commander in Chief, who has charted his course of leadership in the free world community and proclaimed his position to the people of all nations.

There were skeptics, of course. There were those who doubted the wisdom of the President's policies. However, more and more leaders of liberty-loving nations everywhere are supporting these policies and joining with our President in standing firmly united against our common Communist foe.

Now, perhaps more than ever before in recent history, the free world stands strongly in unison against the aggressive acts of our enemy. This united front is due greatly to the determined action and firm know-how leadership of President Johnson.

Surely all Americans, and indeed the entire free world, owe President Lyndon B. Johnson a debt of gratitude.

Our Nation's editors, who have followed closely the turn of events in foreign affairs, appreciate and understand the international importance of President Johnson's courageous actions. In this connection, I would like at this time to insert in the Record an editorial by Mr. Robert G. Spivack as it appeared in the May 5, 1965, issue of the New York Journal-American.

This article clearly demonstrates that the American people are strongly in support of our great President:

[From the New York Journal-American,
May 5, 1965]

WATCH ON THE POTOMAC: REDS LEARN L.B.J.'s TOUGH

(By Robert G. Spivack)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson is proving as much of a professional in his handling of international crises as in domestic affairs.

In every open confrontation with the Communists during his 17 months as President they have more than met their match. Where the Communists have tried to capitalize on ambiguity, chaos, and confusion, as in the Dominican Republic, the President has not been found wanting either.

It has taken the Communists, torn by dissension and under heavy Chinese pressure, a little time to realize what they were up against. The new President was, to them

and to many Americans, an unknown quantity. But they may be catching on. The best measure of how badly they have been hurt is how loudly they have howled since the bombing of North Vietnamese military installations.

No one expects them to let up in their efforts to probe for L.B.J.'s weak spots, or give up taunting here and testing there, looking for whatever openings they can find. But, unlike some of L.B.J.'s fuzzy-minded critics at home, they are completely realistic.

If there is no advantage to be gained in Santo Domingo, they will retreat, since restoration of constitutional government under the liberal Juan Bosch was never their real objective. In Vietnam there are new indications that they would like a temporary cessation to hostilities, because of the punishment they have been taking and might yet take.

Has the President's policy succeeded in North Vietnam? Perhaps it is too early to tell. But one European expert on Far Eastern affairs who briefed the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in executive session forecast nearly a month ago that Red China would react cautiously to the American action.

Now, obscured by the headlines from the Dominican Republic, comes news that the Vietcong guerrillas say they do not want "volunteers" from China or the Soviet Union, that they want to win the war themselves. It's a good propaganda line, especially since their allies have not seemed over-eager to have a military confrontation with the United States.

What of the President's intervention in the Dominican revolt? At this stage there are several mysteries about that unhappy affair, especially its timing. Perhaps Bosch will explain why at this particular moment an effort was made to overthrow the civilian junta. Bosch is no Castroite; he is a close friend of former Gov. Muñoz-Marin of Puerto Rico, who is a good friend of the United States.

But he is also something of a political innocent. The whole affair looks very amateurish, not simply because Castroites and other Communists could be expected to move in quickly and try to take control, but because the rebels did not understand how L.B.J. would respond.

The President is aware that the Dominican military are no friends of democracy, that many are ex-Trujilloites. But he could not risk a second front being opened against the United States while we were engaged in Vietnam. Better than others he knows the inside story of the halfway measures taken at the Bay of Pigs; he was determined there would be nothing like that again.

Johnson does not expect the presence of U.S. Marines to solve the Dominican problems. They were a temporary, but necessary, expedient. But to know when to take such measures and to act decisively is what distinguishes the pro from the amateur.

Rumanian Independence Day**SPEECH**

OF

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago Soviet communism crushed the freedom and independence of many civilized European nations, among them the sovereign, constitutional, and so-

cially progressive Kingdom of Rumania, established on the 10th of May 1881. Transformed into a so-called peoples republic, Rumania today is in fact a Soviet colony, ruled by the naked force and incredible terror of totalitarian tyranny. To stifle the national feeling of the people, even the celebration of the 10th of May—the traditional national holiday—has been forbidden. Today only the refugees scattered over the free world, many of them in our own country, are able to perpetuate the sacred tradition and in so doing, to draw our attention to the present tragedy and the just aspirations of their oppressed people.

As a nation conceived in freedom and committed to its defense everywhere, we Americans feel deeply saddened by the plight of the Rumanians and appreciate highly their valiant resistance to tyranny as a valuable contribution to the general struggle against the Communist menace. Let us therefore take advantage of the anniversary of the 10th of May to convey to Rumanians everywhere the sincere sympathy and the very best wishes of the American people. Let us assure them anew of our determination to pursue, with prudence of course, but with firmness, our national commitment as defenders of freedom. We consider the right of all peoples to freely choose their governments as sacred and inalienable and in the common interest of peace. Thus we cannot and will not acquiesce in their enslavement or accept the status quo as permanent. On the contrary, we are dutybound to support their strivings for freedom by all peaceful means, and express our conviction in the ultimate victory of our common efforts.

Recent developments in the Communist world add considerable substance to our hopes, especially concerning the Rumanians. A great deal has been written recently about a seemingly radical change of mind and policy by Rumania's Communist rulers, who are alleged to have become politically—but not militarily and economically—"almost independent" of Moscow, eager to put national interests above Communist allegiance and to intensify contacts with the West. Consequently the West, and our administration particularly, has decided to encourage by all means, mainly economic, the Bucharest regime in its new orientation.

We certainly welcome any change for the better in Rumania, provided it be genuine, and we wholeheartedly approve any American help, provided it improves the lot of the people more than it strengthens the Communist regime. Well knowing that it was the stubborn will for freedom of the Rumanians which compelled their rulers to make certain "concessions" to the national sentiment and national interests, we must make it clear that we do not intend to recognize the Communist regime as legitimate, or to bail it out from its self-created economic chaos simply for its own sake. Our intention is to alleviate the lot of the people and thus make them more able to assert more forcefully their will to freedom. Any confusion or misrepresentation concerning this fundamental position might tend to dishearten the